University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of author: **Lee Carmel Ellis**

Title of thesis: **Ten Days for Global Justice: A Study of a Non-formal Approach to Global Education in Alberta**

Degree: **Master of Education**

Year this degree was granted: **2002**

University of Alberta

Ten Days for Global Justice: A Study of a Non-formal Approach to Global Education in Alberta

by

Lee Carmel Ellis Ⓒ

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

in

International and Global Education.

Department of Educational Policy Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2002

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **Ten Days for Global Justice: A Study of a Non-formal Approach to Global Education in Alberta** submitted by Lee Carmel Ellis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in International and Global Education.

Dedication

To my Mother and Father, my family, and to Jennifer and Sarah,

with love.

Abstract

This study examines one organizational response to the problem of integrating approaches to identifying root causes of global violence and non-violent strategies for building a more peaceful world. Ten Days for Global Justice (TEN DAYS) is a Canadian Christian faith-based nonformal global education programme patterned on a Freirean model of critical pedagogy. The study objective was to provide a critical understanding and analysis of the programme's vision and mission through in-depth interviews with selected programme participants to determine the core goals, objectives, and strategies regarding development or global education. Effectiveness of approaches and relevant lessons for other non-governmental oganizations committed to increasing the understanding and solidarity of Canadians to global issues of development, aid and related problems were examined. Implications for further global education work of the emphasis on a development paradigm which identifies structural injustices, worldwide, as the root causes of peacelessness and violence were also assessed.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to friends, family and colleagues for support during this project. On-going encouragement and direction from Dr. Toh, my thesis supervisor, has been invaluable. I would also like to thank Dr. Sue Scott and Dr. Linda Ogilvie, my committee members, for insightful comments and suggestions.

Research participants from the Ten Days for Global Justice Program deserve special thanks for their willingness to share their time and expertise and for their long-term commitment to the goal of a more just and peaceful world. I look forward to the leavening influence of TEN DAYS and successor organizations in Canadian and global society in times to come.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Background to the Study

Human beings are the only species with a history. Whether they also have a future is not so obvious. The answer will lie in the prospects for popular movements, with firm roots among all sectors of the population, dedicated to values that are surpressed or driven to the margins within the existing social and political order: community, solidarity, concern for a fragile environment that will have to sustain future generations, creative work under voluntary control, independent thought, and true democratic participation in varied aspects of life. (Chomsky, 1991, p. 136)

Following World War II, the predominant approach to aid and development followed the model established by the United States-sponsored European Recovery Program (1948-1952) which was designed to rehabilitate the economies of European states. More commonly known as the Marshall Plan, the program targeted conditions of poverty and dislocation which slowed post-war economic recovery and reduced popular support for Western-backed regimes. Focusing predominantly on Western European economic reconstruction, the plan was based upon the idea of self-help with financial assistance as necessary to restart the engines of industry, agriculture, finance and trade. In a remarkably short time, the economies of the sixteen nations of the Organization for European Cooperation, plus West Germany, did recover. On the basis of this success, the Marshall Plan was expanded under a new Four Point Program (1949) and the model was applied to underdeveloped countries worldwide.

This approach to aid and development, which came to be known as the modernization approach, was widely used in post-independence African and Asian nations where the benefits of growth to end hunger and poverty promoted during international development decades did not materialize. Increasing evidence showed benefits accruing to national and regional elites in parts of the developing world but not to the people who were the ostensible intended beneficiaries of development assistance programs. As the evidence mounted that the dominant modernization approach to development was predicated upon assumptions and conditions peculiar to post-WWII Western European states, and was not directly applicable to new-formed nation states emerging from centuries of colonial rule, questions were raised about models or approaches which might be more appropriate.

Since the late 1960s, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and educators in North countries like Canada, especially those in the broad field of international aid and development, have emphasized the key role of non-formal education in raising critical awareness among citizens about the realities of world hunger, poverty and underdevelopment. This movement, initially referred to as development education, drew particularly on the insights of critical pedagogy advocates such as Paulo Freire to motivate citizens to engage in advocacy and solidarity actions that will help promote people-centred

development in the Third World or South countries. In Canada, people who had worked overseas with organizations like CUSO began to examine different ways of looking at "development." Based on their exposures to grassroots realities of poverty and underdevelopment, these volunteers began to question the gap between theory and practice of the modernization paradigm. On returning to Canada, they deemed it essential to help Canadians better understand Third World or South inequalities and hunger, thus catalyzing the movement popularly called development education. Likewise, churches in Canada and other North countires also began to join the chorus of voices questioning the validity of elite-centred modernization. Thus arose church-based NGOs such as Ten Days for World Development (later called Ten Days for Global Justice), the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights in Latin America, the Inter-Church Coalition on Africa, the Canada-Asia Working Group, the Inter-Church Committee on Refugees, and more recently groups like InterPares.

In recent years the field of development education has also converged with a broader vision of education for personal and societal transformation, namely global education. Global education seeks to integrate in an holistic way the major world views and problems of not only development and global justice but also militarization, human rights, environmental protection, intercultural conflicts, and personal peace. Especially important is the linking issues of peace, development, and human rights, where peace is understood to be a precondition for development, and where development, including economic aspects, is seen as a fundamental human right; where eradication of global poverty and global injustice is central to changing international relations between North and South, rich and poor, between the powerful and the marginalized. In some areas, peace education and global education are synonymous. In others, one is privileged above the other. Here, the "multidimensional concept" of development, including democracy and human rights, is at the centre of global education. Thus, the problem for this study is to focus on a part of the task of global education while keeping the whole in mind.

While since the 1960s, there has been a steadily growing movement of NGOs involved in development education in Canada, systematic research into these efforts has not been extensive. It is timely, therefore, as we enter a new century to learn some helpful lessons from the development education work of specific NGOs. In this study I have decided, due to my earlier concerns, clarified later in this chapter, to focus on the ecumenical church-based NGO, Ten Days for Global Justice (hereafter referred to as TEN DAYS).

Development Education

As indications of the failure of the modernization paradigm of development to address conditions of poverty and inequality became clearer, that national elites were benefiting from aid allocations while schools, health clinics, and water wells were not being constructed, more NGOs and civil society organizations (CSOs), like TEN DAYS, became involved in development and global education. Earlier, practitioners made distinctions between development education and global education. The standard view now is that good development education is global education and unless someone makes it clear that it is otherwise, the terms may be used more or less interchangeably.

The challenge to the growing development education movement was to explain why the modernization approach was not working, and what might be better approaches in the face of the global reality of increasing marginalization. Many Canadian overseas workers and volunteers who returned from working in developing, Third World, or underdeveloped countries saw in education the hope or promise of raising public awareness about issues of development and the positive, concrete responses which could be, and were being, made throughout the world as alternatives to the top-down approaches of modernization. Non-formal adult education came to be seen as the most realistic approach to education for action.

Many of those returning from work overseas in the late 1960s and early 1970s had affiliations with Canadian churches and saw the possibility of an institutional approach to issues of social justice, to which the churches were no strangers. The question became how to expand and extend those concerns to the international scene, to issues of global social justice. Ten Days for World Development (later it became Ten Days for Global Justice) was one of the responses. It attempted to move beyond the modernization, or charity, model of development to a justice model. Further questions were raised about basic conceptions and understandings of development. What was meant by the term?

In order to better understand the nature of development and global education, we can look at conceptually-distinct world views which have been identified and which seek to influence the direction, methods of implementation, goals and objectives, effects and activities of global education. The first world-view is the dominant state-sanctioned position, or the "neomercantilist-national interest" view which insists that global education should "prepare citizens for participation in an anarchic and competitive international system" (Tye &Tye, 1992, p. 62). In this view the primary motivation is self-interest, little value is

seen in cooperation and outcomes of international relations are often determined by force. The second world-view, what may be called the progressive or liberal view, is held by many educators, and typically global educators. The "international society-communitarian" view is a reformist position which "recognizes both the need and potential for cooperation in attempting to respond to problems and challenges which are global in scope" (p. 62). Pluralism, multilateralism, cooperation, sharing responsibilities are characteristic values of this view. Demonstrated interests and expertise are often factors in the international standing of the state (pp. 62-63). The third world-view, the radical, reconstructionist position includes "system transformer" views:

> In the 'utopian left,' Marxists or neo-Marxists seek to create a more equitable international system through creation of social-democratic systems in which power is decentralized, and in which economic well-being, social justice, and peace are dominant domestic and foreign policy goals. (Tye & Tye, p. 63)

By contrast, proponents of the "utopian-right" and "ultraconservative" views feel this view and the following:

> particularly threatened by global education. The first group, mostly composed of religious fundamentalists, see global education as a manifestation of secular humanism which threatens their own deeply held religious beliefs. The other school is made up of individuals and subgroups, often interlocking, who see global education as a threat to the promotion and dominance of American values and ideals. It is their view that these values and ideals should be taught in our schools as truths and that, in fact, they should be transported throughout the world. (p. 63)

Lamy (1989) offers differing views or images of the content and purposes of global education. The first is that international education is an essential element of U.S. national security and an important ingredient in promoting national economic growth; the *national interest-neomercantilist* motivation is currently the dominant U.S. view. The second view supports the idea that the international system has become more pluralistic and that global education is necessary to prepare U.S. students to participate in more pluralistic decision-making environments. Instead of seeing the world as anarchic and competitive, the *international society-communitarians* recognize that transformations in the international system (for example, the emergence of an interconnected global economy) have created patterns of interaction, processes of decision-making and rules of behavior not unlike those found in a domestic political system. A third view of global education supports it as a way of promoting change in the international system; an agenda that encourages the development of attitudes and then policies aimed at securing peace, social justice, a clean environment and economic well-being for all citizens. This is not the dominant concept in the global education community but it has been identified by critics of global education as the intellectual centre of the movement. However, global education does not constitute an attack

by radical Marxists on American schools. Instead, it is an attempt by well-meaning educators to introduce U.S. citizens to a more pluralistic reality (Lamy, pp. 40-47).

To this point, the view is that the future of global education efforts will be influenced by the debates among national interest-mercantilists, international society-communitarians and, less significantly, utopian visions on the left and right. There is little need to make a special appeal for global education. Most formal educators support global education but have different visions of what it is and what its purposes are. From the perspective of nonformal education generally, and for TEN DAYS in particular, there are two models of interest. First, the dominant "mainstream model" or modernization approach, "accepted by a majority of Western governments and major international development agencies." For McGowan (1987), this approach is characterized by the assumption that

> the poor elements of society will eventually benefit from the success of modernizing elites and the application of market forces as they did historically in Western Europe and North America. In other words, the results of economic growth and modernization with trickle down to the poor. (p. 44 in Werner, 1990, p. 9)

On the face of it, this seems to be somewhat more disinterested, less self-serving than the neo-mercantilist approach but the results are substantially the same and, to some extent, by design. Following World War II, when the modernization model or paradigm was first coming to prominence, leading U. S. foreign policy planners openly declared that because

> We have 50 per cent of the world's wealth, but only 6.3 per cent of its population . . . . our real job in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which permit us to maintain this position of disparity. To do so, we have to dispense with all sentimentality . . . . we should cease thinking about human rights, the raising of living standards and democratisation. (George Kennan, U. S. State Department Policy Planning, Study #23, 1948, cited in Pilger, 1998, p. 59)

Insofar as this assessment was heeded with respect to where the United States and other Western nations, including most of the world's remaining colonial powers, should focus their foreign policy strategy, the "dependency model" may be a more accurate reflection of global socio-economic reality. It takes the position "that the wealth of the one world is linked to the poverty of the other world. Inequalities are the result of policies and trading patterns that historically favored the rich and powerful, and are not the outcome of invariant and natural stages of development" (Werner, 1990, p. 9).

Another global educator, Toh Swee-Hin (1993) takes the position that global literacy, awareness and understanding of what is happening in the world at the local, regional, national and international levels, is shaped by at least two fundamental world views. First, the "liberal-technocratic paradigm," predominant in Canadian and other educational

systems, has four major themes: (1) a philosophical orientation of liberal appreciation for the culture of others which leaves unexplored the authenticity of our feelings towards others, and tends to promote cultural understanding which is fragmented into superficialities and trivialities; (2) "interdependence," especially from an economic perspective, which seldom questions the *quality* and *history* of these interconnections and interdependencies; (3) a management interpretation of interdependence in which a dangerous world needs to be managed, interdependence must be safely controlled; and (4) human progress, the measure of which is advanced industrial civilization, driven by unbridled economic growth and high mass-consumption (pp. 9-17).

The second fundamental world view, the transformative paradigm of global literacy,
> empowers learners not only to critically understand the world's realities in a holistic
> framework, but also to move learners and teachers to act towards a more peaceful,
> just and liberating world . . . . Global literacy helps us appreciate our role, by
> commission or omission, in the world fabric of events, relationships, systems, and
> structures . . . . It stresses the basic problem of planetary survival ecological
> security. A transformative curriculum encourages learners to grasp a sense of their
> human responsibilities and to become engaged in local political practice [and] an
> empowering pedagogy for global literacy invites learners to participate actively, to
> link their knowledge and awareness with fellow learners. (Toh, 1993, pp. 11-15)

The importance of role models is strongly emphasized where any approach to development education which
> excludes global literacy results in a serious loss of meaning. Transformative global
> literacy is a vehicle to nurture and cultivate the meaning of being a *human being* . . .
> . part of the web of life. Global literacy, in a transformative paradigm, tries to move
> us to creatively and actively shape and care for that web of life. (Toh, 1993, p. 16)

Pike (1997) comments on the continuing diversity of thought among global educators in his examination of what he has identified as the two principal paradigms of global education, where "Global education is not one approach to teaching and learning, but a plethora of overlapping styles . . . . among global educators can be found the richness of multiple perspectives that they themselves consider such an important constituent of learning" (pp. 7-8). The two paradigms are here termed the *compartmentalist* and the *holistic*. From the compartmentalist perspective,
> global education is viewed essentially as enriching the curriculum with a global
> perspective: infusing ideas, images and experiences from other countries and
> cultures into the existing subject framework, principally in the social sciences . . . .a
> view of the world as divided into separate cultures, countries, environments and
> species. Interdependence and connectedness may be frequently explained and
> demonstrated, but the overriding conceptual model belies such a systems view of the
> world. (pp. 8-9)

6

In contrast, the holistic paradigm of global education is clearly in the transformationist or reconstructionist tradition and

> represents a philosophy of education that seeks to model schooling on a contemporary vision of the world that is in part realistic and in part idealistic. Its realism is founded upon the theories of leading-edge science, suggesting that the planet is an integrated, dynamic, living system, whose essence is wholeness. Its idealism stems from a belief that education can play a fundamentally different role in society: Rather than being a mere reflector of dominant social and cultural values, it can be a vehicle for the active promotion of human and planetary improvement. (Pike, 1997, p. 9)

Another way of looking at approaches to development and global education is by recognizing explicitly the main political identities or ideological orientations of global educators. Three broad approaches have emerged, with their attendant ideological implications: the Conservative, the Liberal, and the Transformational. Following Arnold, Burke, James, Martin, & Thomas (1991), "The content of conservative education is the worldview and experience of the elites, which all others are expected to appreciate, if not emulate; and the function is to maintain the legitimacy of the status quo" (p. 19). At the level of technocratic thinking where "expertise" is most important, the conservative method

> is to trivialize or dismiss outright the life experience of learners. This requires labelling certain uses of language as correct, certain kinds of knowledge as valuable. When the social identity[1] of the learners is different from the dominant group in race, class, gender, religion, or culture, they must be made to feel that their ideas are primitive and their aspirations 'unrealistic'. Then they will be fully open to the imposition of conservative education (p. 20).

Liberal approaches draw on classical humanism where the emphasis is on individualism, self-directed learning and social reform; "the focus is on attitudes rather than structures, on the individual rather than the collectivity, on personal growth rather than political transformation." On the one hand, "the strength of this approach is its insight into human potential and individual diversity, and its resistance to manipulative teaching practices." On the other, "liberal adult educators will undertake to improve unjust situations but avoid tackling the root causes of injustice" (Arnold, et al., 1991, p. 21). On the whole, liberal approaches studiously avoid issues of power relations. The "resolute naiveté" implicit in the view that education is neutral flies in the face of social reality where "individuals are socially situated in an unequal world" (p. 22).

The third set of approaches, termed Transformational, are those where "educators connected to movements for radical democratic transformation work to link the goals of revolutionary politics with democratic practice and to build a variety of approaches to

---

[1] The social location of the learner "in relation to those who wield power in society" (Arnold, et al., p.13).

learning" (Arnold, et al., 1991, p. 22). The range of theory and practice in this category lie on a "continuum from most participatory to most top-down or *vanguardist*" (p. 22). For this study, and in the theory and practice of TEN DAYS, the preference is clearly toward the more participatory end of the continuum.

> In transformational approaches, education is part of a movement for individual and collective liberation, which promotes learning for critical consciousness and collective action. Such education seeks to transform power relations in society, relations between teachers and learner, and relations among learners. In this sense it is radically democratic. (p. 22)

The content of transformational approaches is grounded in "the situation of oppression and the possible strategies for social change" which learners seek to confront. The method

> begins with the lived experience of the learners, with validating it and exploring, through dialogue, its humanizing as well as oppressive dimensions. The method then moves to collective discussion about action, to the possibilities of transforming the oppressive elements of experience. This dynamic of reflection/action, or 'praxis', is central to transformational approaches. (Arnold, et al., 1991, p. 22)

The roots of these approaches are found "in socialist and Third World liberation struggles," and key thorists include Paulo Freire, Antonio Gramsci and Julius Nyerere (Arnold, et al., 1991, p. 22).

There is concern that "top-down" approaches to transformational education, where "correct theory in the heads of an enlightened few can translate into effective social justice work," are not pedagogically sound, at least not in the context of popular and participatory education. At the same time, participatory education taken to the opposite extreme can lead to a kind of liberal individualism. The need is for "a new wave of thought to extend transformational education and challenges on a broader scale and to the opportunities that arise when oppositional movements actually win a measure of political power" (Arnold, et al., 1991, p. 23). The central point in this discussion of approaches to global education is that "political identity is integral to the critical and self-critical reflection of activist educators" (p. 23).

The TEN DAYS approach to popular education is exemplified by that advocated by the Maquila Solidarity Network (2000) where "the fundamental aim is to empower people and improve their conditions and defend their rights" (p. 3). This approach begins with people's everyday experience, doesn't pretend to be neutral, challenges unequal power relations, encourages equitable participation, encourages collective action for change, models and develops democratic practices, draws on the whole person, has a vision of long term goals and leads to action (p. 3). The Maquila Solidarity Network (MSN) has, since 1995,

played a central role in promoting the Canadian Stop Sweatshops campaign through networks of labour, faith, student, women's, international development and community groups involved with the defense and improvement of workers' rights and working and living conditions in the maquiladora and export processing zones of Latin America and Asia (p. 1).

The three major development education paradigms (education for amelioration, for interdependence, and for transformation), follow closely the major theories of development-- modernization, dependency, and social transformation / participation, respectively (Reimer, Shute, & McCreary, 1993, pp. 1-15). Recent CCIC (2002) concerns regarding CIDA's approach to aid and development reflect a growing frustration that CIDA is moving closer to a modernization approach to development, with "a focus on short-term Canadian economic and political interests" while neglecting longer term interests of developing countries and failing to "challenge unequal global economic and political structures" (p. 8). CCIC noted that in this "new development context . . . a narrow conception of civil society's role in development cooperation" undermines the historic links many Canadian CSOs have established "with Southern counterparts . . . that consolidate more diverse and shared roles based on a common pursuit of rights and global justice." In the context of the focus of this present thesis, the identification of root causes of violence and non-violent strategies for moving toward a more just and peaceful world, note that

> CCIC and its members place poverty eradication as the sole goal of Canada's aid programs. As the work of Nobel laurate Amartya Sen demonstrates, people-centred development for poverty eradication is ultimately about recognizing the rights of the vulnerable, and transforming the power relations and cultural and social interests that sustain inequality. Support for poverty reduction requires interventions that address not only capacities to improve livelihoods, but also unequal power, capacity and access to resources for those whose rights are denied (CCIC, 2002, p. 2).

The document continues, observing that for these and other reasons, "Many in civil society are challenging their political leaders, in the South and in the North, as they perceive northern dominated global institutions, such as the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF, to be acting in concert with bilateral donors to consolidate a system of highly unequal relations within and between countries" (CCIC, 2002, p. 2). Furthermore, "refusal to countenance any proposals for reform of unequal power relations in the WTO and the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), has set the stage for increased North / South polarization" (p. 2).

This unfortunate reality is in stark contrast with the ideals espoused by TEN DAYS which, like other

Canadian CSOs consider public engagement a vital component of Canadian development programming. Engagement is seen as integral to increasing public awareness of and action on global disparities, broadening our understanding of rights and responsibilties to encompass global citizenship, and concern about development and fairness in the world. Ethical values shared widely in the Canadian population are a foundation for global citizenship that can be built upon. (CCIC, 2002, pp. 2-3)

Here we have a sense of the views which have informed approaches to development and global education for several decades. Greater and lesser impulses toward transformaitive and participatory approaches have been seen. As this paper suggests, the modernization approach is favored by certain global elite interests, while the transformative approaches favor far greater numbers of people. Modernization approaches have been referred to as globalization-from-above in recent years. The brief mention of CCIC attempts at intevention with the development arm of the Canadian government helps to focus the concerns of this paper regarding the impact on development of structural adjustment programs, privatization and trade liberalization, free trade and export-oriented agriculture, industries producing first for export, then for local consumption; the trend is toward commodification of everything, including education, health care, water. The ongoing tension is between the "short-term economic and political interests" of the few and long-term, sustainable development for the many, and a more peaceful, secure world.

TEN DAYS and Development Education

The purpose of this research is, through in-depth interviews, to examine the perceptions of a small number of active, informed participants in one Canadian model of an approach to non-formal adult global education. Ten Days for Global Justice (TEN DAYS) is a nonformal educational program established in the early 1970s by the five mainline Canadian Christian churches (Presbyterian, Lutheran, United, Roman Catholic, Anglican -- the PLURA churches) to alert Canadians to various problems and issues in Third World societies, and ways in which these are related to Canadian social, political and economic realities, as well as possible strategies for addressing areas of mutual concern. TEN DAYS was inspired by an understanding of the Biblical imperative for social justice, and seeks to provide more comprehensive information to concerned Canadians, raise levels of awareness amongst the uncommitted, and encourage all to take critical action in their special areas of interest and concern, while acting in solidarity with others who share their same general concerns and choose to address the problems and issues in different ways. It is an important example of one approach to a critical and transformative pedagogy in Canada.

The Ten Days for Global Justice Programme was known as Ten Days for World Development when it came into being in 1973. The name was changed in 1995 to better reflect clearer understandings of global reality and solidarity. "TEN DAYS" refers to an initial ten-day period during which cross-Canada consultations were held between congregations and church leaders before formal establishment of the programme. Although the initial focus was on development education aimed at adherents of the member churches, as well as other Canadians who shared the concern that, worldwide, there were firmly-entrenched structural injustices which needed to be addressed, the intent was to eventually include all of Canadian society in the struggle for justice.

Prior to the establishment of Ten Days for World Development in Canada, there were some momentous events within the worldwide Christian church. The winds of change were being felt throughout Christendom and, in chronological order of the occurrence of widely-publicized events, the Second Vatican Council (1962 - 1965) came first. Although the Vatican had set the agenda for the Council (popularly known as Vatican II), and most of the Archbishops were prepared to ratify this status quo agenda, certain influential Cardinals were able to prevail over the will of the Vatican; the Council voted for an agenda set by the bishops and archbishops themselves. The door was opened for change and a general perception arose among Catholics that the church could not only change but that it could change rapidly, *if necessary.*

Certain theologians, especially Latin American theologians, were able to find support for their position that one of the fundamental responsibilities of the church was to work purposefully toward transforming the social conditions which bound so many of the people of the earth to lives of poverty, disease and degradation. An essential part of this new "preferential option for the poor" was the church-sanctioned Base Christian Community movement which was actively promoted throughout Latin America.

In 1968 the World Council of Churches (WCC - Protestant) held its Fourth Assembly in Uppsala, Sweden where parallels with Vatican II were evident. One final statement "included the affirmation of the dignity of the human person, and a concept of mission that is radically grounded in the needs of the poor, and affirms the integral relationship between personal conversion and social responsibility" (cited in Larson, 1988, p. 50). That same year the Second Council of Latin American Bishops was convened in Medellín, Colombia. At Medellín the fundamental role that Liberation Theology had "in influencing the change in understanding of the role of the church in the world. . . . [and the part played by] the

analysis and influence of theologians, social scientists and practicing Christians in the Third World" was evident (p. 51).

In the Canadian context, these three events, Vatican II, Uppsala and Medellín, helped advance an emphasis on an ecumenical approach to development education and inter-church coalitions for social action. This approach took two forms: (1) speaking "to the Canadian public, and the Canadian governing bodies from a distinctly Christian perspective" and (2) speaking "in concert with other sectors of the Canadian public on issues which are of concern not only to the churches but to the whole human family" (Larson, 1988, p. 52). The first step in this process was to weld certain segments of the PLURA churches into a coherent, consensual coalition and then to reach into the larger community to cooperate and collaborate with like-minded secular groups and individuals.

In 1969 the relief and development arms of the various churches met for the first time to discuss a comprehensive approach to various issues of concern and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) provided funding support for non-governmental organization (NGO) relief and development work, thus effectively "shift[ing] the focus of the churches' common effort from domestic to international poverty issues" (Larson, 1988, pp. 61-62). By 1971 there was general recognition of the need for education relevant to development issues and about the same time the Canadian Council of Churches and the Canadian Catholic Conference held meetings with professionals in the areas of poverty, education, and communication where "the educational dimension of development work was affirmed [and] the initial concepts for Ten Days for World Development were articulated." One of the key elements of TEN DAYS was the link between education and action (p. 63).

The importance of liberation theology to TEN DAYS was clear. Likewise, there was recognition of the pre-eminence of Freire, whose
> insightful identification of the dialogical process as instrumental to education for social transformation lies at the heart of development education . . . . The practice of development education in Canada clearly reflects the influence of Paulo Freire and the priority of dialogical education . . . . development education adopts a dialogical methodology which involves participants in a mutually reinforcing process of teaching and learning. This methodology is derived from Paulo Freire's insistence that people must be involved as subject in their own education, and that people bring with them to the educational process important and legitimate human experience which can be used as the basis for a social analysis of reality. (Larson, 1988, pp. 15, 17)

An overview of the historical timeline for TEN DAYS and the themes from 1973 to 2001 reflects the coherence of this approach to education for action and reflection leading to

further informed action. It is consistent with both a secular view of popular and participatory education as well as the *praxis* model of theological reflection, action and further reflection upon which the TEN DAYS programme is based. The timeline is found in the December 1996 Special 25th Anniversary Issue of *Update, 3* (2).

Focus of the Research

The research focus was (1) to examine an organization involved in a program of nonformal global education; (2) to discover how program participants perceived the goals, objectives, educational strategies, challenges and lessons from their involvement; and (3) to consider the implications for the future of global education in Alberta and Canada. In this regard, the study sought to provide a critical understanding and analysis of the vision and mission of Ten Days for Global Justice (TEN DAYS). Focusing in particular on the Alberta region's activities of TEN DAYS, the research examined the following major questions:

1. From the perspectives and insights of a sample of key Alberta organizers and leaders of Ten Days, what are the core goals, objectives and strategies of the group with regard to the global education of Canadians?

2. In the view of these leaders to what degree have TEN DAYS' strategies of global education been effective in fulfilling the organization's goals and objectives? What obstacles have been encountered, and how have they been faced or overcome?

3. Based on the experiences of TEN DAYS as a long-standing non-governmental organization (NGO) or civil society organization (CSO) committed to increasing the understanding and solidarity of Canadians to global issues of development, aid and related problems, what positive and negative lessons may be drawn to enhance the non-formal practice of global education in general, and the future work of TEN DAYS in particular?

4. Drawing upon the theory and practice of global education that is expanding worldwide, what paradigmatic emphasis can be found in the goals, objectives and strategies of TEN DAYS and what implication will such emphasis hold for the 'success' of TEN DAYS as a non-formal global education agency in the 21st century?

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study lies in the need on the one hand for NGO and CSO action and the need on the other hand for more analysis. There is a need to step back and learn from critical reflection, to engage in the action-reflection-action cycle in a systematic way. In part, it is consistent with the need to share stories of successes and failures, lessons learned, consistent with approaches to good development education practice. Systematic study may offer some advantages over ad hoc approaches which are often the only possibility for active development and global educators.

The relevance of this study for me is tied to my personal interest in development issues related, in fact, to earlier exposure to the educational work of TEN DAYS in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Living and working in northern Alberta at that time, I attended a few public educational events sponsored by TEN DAYS and read much of the related background material. I was also involved more directly in the development education work of the Anglican Church and between the two church-based initiatives (the Anglican Primate's World Relief and Development Fund and TEN DAYS) the questions which were being raised related to development and justice; trade, development, and justice; hunger as a function of landlessness and unemployment; hunger, dispossession and oppression; models of development and participatory development. In time, when I entered graduate academic studies in Rural Economy at the University of Alberta, I focused on issues and concerns of rural development with the intention of working in Central America. As things turned out, I worked for five years in a civil war zone in Southern Africa, Angola, where issues of participatory and democratic development were superceded by concerns about surviving until tomorrow. The objective of my work there was to establish, or more accurately to re-establish, a Centre for Rural Development intended to train agricultural and health extension workers for a large agricultural area in the central highlands of Angola. In actuality, most of my time was devoted to distributing seeds, tools, fertilizers, emergency food rations, to internally displaced persons who had been allotted communal plots of land to grow corn, beans, and vegetables.

The lessons I learned from the Angolan refugees, peasant agriculturalists, and from town and city folk alike, was that what they needed was not more globalization-from-above. Rather, the need was for fairer, more equitable access to resources and a peaceful, secure socio-economic, political situation in which to enjoy that access, with their families and fellow citizens. The message I heard over and again was the need to educate people in Canada, the United States, Western Europe, the rich and powerful of the world, to the realities of life in other parts of the world.

Upon my return to Canada in the late 1990s I chose to enter the International and Global Education program at the University of Alberta. I saw this as an opportunity to engage in critical reflection on my earlier experience in grassroots development, and to deepen my understanding of development and global education. For these reasons, I therefore chose as my thesis topic to focus specifically on one development education / global education NGO, namely Ten Days for Global Justice.

Chapter Two: Theory and Practice of Development /
Global / Peace Education

Policies of governments and companies are keeping people poor. Policies that ensure global trade benefits the rich, not the poor -- the three richest men in the world are wealthier than the 48 poorest countries combined. (World Development Movement, 2002)

. . . an obscene system that considers interest payments sacrosanct while the most minimal quality of life for citizens of indebted countries becomes a luxury to be splurged on if the debts have been paid . . . . Today entire societies are imprisoned, their children starved and deprived of health care and education, and yet the logic of international account balances exonerates the bankers who insist on seeing their profit line grow at the expense of entire generations . . . . This outrageous undeclared war on the poor has gone on far too long. (50 Years is Enough Network, 1999)

. . . I find it hard to avoid the conclusion that the wealth of the rich is maintained through the neglect of the poor, especially by means of international debt. (Dalai Lama, 1999)

This chapter examines the theoretical background to ways of contextualizing the concerns which are the focus of development education programmes of NGOs such as Ten Days for Global Justice. As noted in chapter 1, there are various ways of understanding the global realities of poverty and underdevelopment, thus the views contained in the dominant modernization paradigm have provided the foundational ideas in the current advance of global capitalism or imperialism, referred to nowadays as "globalization" (or, more accurately, globalization-from-above). Alternatively, I have analyzed why and how the modernization or globalization-from-above paradigm has been increasingly critiqued and challenged by a critical transformational paradigm. In the following section, I will elaborate on the theory and practice of development / global / peace education through two dimensions: first, the Christian Church's perspectives on "social justice" that underpins and inspires the work of church-based NGOs such as TEN DAYS; secondly, the current discourse on globalization that helps us contextualize the development / global education orientation of TEN DAYS.

Social Justice

A prior response to the unencumbered expansion of global capital, from the perspective of the established church, is found in two foundational statements of the Roman Catholic Church's position on social justice and social reform. Papal encyclicals presented the church's views on appropriate responses to the social problems created by the Industrial Revolution in Europe (*Rerum Novarum,* 1891) and to the reality of class struggle and class conflict (*Quadragesimo Ano,* 1931). It should be made clear that by the late 1800s the Catholic Church felt compelled to develop

Christianity's most comprehensive response to the forces unleashed by the industrial revolution. In France and Germany especially, avant-garde Catholic priests and members of the laity began the process of forging links with the working class. The turning point came when the pioneer papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum,*

promulgated in 1891 by Leo XIII, called for social concerns to become an integral part of Catholic life. Built upon a blend of reactionary and conservative notions, this letter advocated justice for the worker based largely on a paternalistic medievalism and religious defence rather than socialist thought. Despite these serious limitations it began what has come to be known as the 'social doctrine of the church'(Arnal, 1998, p. 52).

Within a relatively short period of time, in 1931,Pope Pius XI, in the Papal Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Ano,*

> accepted several elements in the Marxist critique of capitalisim. He agreed with Lenin that 'free enterprise' must evolve into monopoly capitalism, 'an international imperialism whose country is where profit is', a system not able to curb or control itself or to direct economic life, and in consequence ultimately self-destructive. The free market, Pius charged, 'of its own nature' concentrates power in anti-social types, in those 'who fight most violently and give least heed to their conscience'. (MacEoin, 1997)

Throughout the remainder of the 20th century, conservative and liberationist elements within the Roman Catholic Church, as well as other Christian denominations, have struggled with the meaning and place of liberation theology. For TEN DAYS, Freire's close and vital relationship with the meaning and place of liberation theology, liberation theologians, the location of conscientization in a critical and emancipatory pedagogy of the oppressed and for freedom, is of central importance. From an overview of approaches to liberation theology, the points of agreement between certain ways of understanding liberation theology and transformational development and global education are quite apparent. Arnal (1998) provides a comprehensive outline of five perceptions of liberation theology, following Brazilian theologians Leonardo and Clodovis Boff and Robert McAfee Brown of the United States:

> In liberation theology the faith is viewed from 'below,' from the perspective of the poor and the oppressed . . . . Not just a few but most of our sisters and brothers on this planet are crushed, shoved aside, and brutally oppressed. It is these people who reside at the centre of liberation theology's concerns and who shape its discourse. (p. 4)

> . . . Liberation theology requires a conscious social activism, and that is the soil out of which theological reflection must emerge. Liberation theology's identification with the poor and oppressed does not arise from charity or pity. Rather it declares solidarity 'with.' The notion of *praxis* is central to this understanding . . . . [and] parallels the notion of *partage* (a total sharing) employed by the French worker-priests to describe their total identity and solidarity with the oppressed working class. In short, liberation theology has a reflective component, but at the same time it creates its theological discourse out of the milieu of militant solidarity with the oppressed and marginalized sectors of society. (p. 5)

> . . .This involvement of such a partisan nature puts liberation theology in a context of conflict, a context that the practitioners accept rather than deny. One of the church's greatest temptations is to see itself as a disinterested arbiter of life's

conflicts. It heralds its catholicity by pointing to the nature of its membership, which includes rich and poor and every gradation in between. Liberationists hasten to point out the illusion in this perspective. They view poverty and oppression as no accident, but rather as the result of human decisions that put power and profit above people. Hence the entire society, including the church, reflects the social structure of domination by the oppressor over the oppressed. Liberationists not only recognize the reality of class divisions but also repudiate the resulting inequities of these cleavages as intolerable in light of the Christian message. For them, solidarity with the poor and marginalized means an inevitable struggle against the powerful interests that are to blame for a brutal and unjust world. (p. 5)

. . . This context of militancy and conflict from the perspective of the marginalized has a profound impact on tools liberationists use in their analysis. Among these tools are the social sciences. . . . disciplines such as political science, history, and sociology . . . . For them [liberationists] the word and work of God can be discerned - indeed, must be discerned - in political, economic, and class relationships. A large number of liberationists draw insights unashamedly from Karl Marx, even in the face of the rabid anti-Red mentality of Western society in general and of the established Christian church in particular . . . . [However,] Those liberation theologians open to the insights of Karl Marx are also critical of him and the movements that bear his name . . . . [In any case,] Marx deserves recognition as one of the greatest social thinkers and critics of modern times. His understanding of oppression and class injustice has resonated globally with popular social movements. Finally, those Christians in solidarity with the oppressed and the poor have found frequently that Marxist militants have been involved in a similar solidarity for an even longer time than most Christians. Quite often Marxists and communists of the developing world have proven to be the most dedicated and self-sacrificing sisters and brothers of the the marginalized sectors of their societies. (pp. 5-6)

. . . Christian liberationists of the developed world, especially middle-class white men, must be deeply critical of their most fundamental values. Robert McAfee Brown states that a basic self-criticism means 'recognizing our ideological captivity'. We need both a radically critical and self-critical spirit as well as the support and solidarity of others for such a task . . . . Brown employs the term 'hermeneutical suspicion' as an antidote to this 'ideological captivity'. . . . [and] would have us develop a suspicious attitude to our learned and utilized hermeneutics. In short, he is saying we need to critically examine our ideological captivity with respect to how we use the Scriptures. (pp. 6-7)

The entrenched power and privilege of the priestly church manifests itself in a deep-rooted opposition to liberation theology, and the consequent growing conservatism of liberation theology itself may be understood as part of an adaptation to the demands of the process of institutionalizing transformative ideas. As sociologist/priest Andrew Greeley (1998) observed, it is impossible to maintain, unchanged, the established institutional relations of power face of an idea whose time has come. The institutional church has accommodated an orientation toward liberation theology but in so doing has rationalized or compromised some of the values of a transformational approach to development and global education.

Globalization

Returning to what is today being called globalization, or globalization-from-above, it can be seen that the questions posed by the interconnectedness of issues and concerns comprising the focus of global education which seeks to integrate in an holistic way the major world views and problems of not only development and global justice but also militarization, human rights, environmental protection, intercultural conflicts, and personal peace, have their roots in "globalization." Globalization, when understood as a form of imperialism, is the most recent stage in the centuries-old struggle for global domination by international capital, and is supported by the currently-dominant ideology of "neo-liberal globalism," defined as

> an ideology of governance seeking to erode national sovereignty in favour of a global regime which seeks the promotion of a highly integrated, corporate-dominated world economy . . . . globalism lays siege to the very idea of the democratic commons [the historical paradigm of shared natural and community resources held in public trust, rooted in the local and reflecting the national and global commonwealth] by means of prevalent public policy initiatives. These initiatives include policies which seek to lower corporate taxes and accommodate international flows of speculative capital, policies which seek to reduce public expenditures and privatise public services, policies which seek to deregulate business and secure monopoly private property rights under law. (Parkland Institute, 2002)

The Parkland Institute's *Globalism Project,* the orientation of which resonates strongly with the understanding of global education outlined in this present research, "is examining the sustainability of such public policy initiatives in terms of the environmental, sociocultural, political, economic, and democratic consequences of globalism." In this context, one of the objectives of global education, as here understood, is to clarify the spirit of globalism as "an ideology of governance" and its ubiquitous nature. The dominance and hegemonic reach of this ideology are such that it now includes some global educators in civil society who are now themselves "globalizers," advancing the agenda of global capital, even as they call for an end to the worst of its effects. Part of the concern for global education is the degree to which the language of liberation, emancipation, conscientization and dialogue, has been coopted by advocates of neo-liberal globalism. Specifically, the "domestication" of Freirean educational approaches has had implications for development education in civil society as practised by the TEN DAYS, NGO / CSO approaches to global education.

This dilemma is highlighted by a recent move by Oxfam International to embrace the ideology of globalism as it simultaneously protests its evils effects. On the one hand, there is legitimate debate about where to draw the line between two paradigms of globalization,

where
> The first paradigm contextualises and embeds trade in more fundamental policies based on people's rights, democratic participation, and ecological sustainability. The second paradigm dismantles democracy, sovereignty and sustainability as 'trade barriers', puts trade above other policy instruments. In disembedding trade from its social and ecological context, it dismembers society and disintegrates ecosystems. It creates poverty by destroying the fabric of economic and ecological security. (Shiva, 2002)

On the other hand, the apparent confusion is, in part the result of intentional cooptation of one of the world's leading CSO / NGO advocates for the first paradigm. The need for a democratic, sustainable approach to globalisation is well-understood by many global educators. Perhaps less well-understood is the degree to which these two paradigms are deliberately confused, most particularly to the detriment of the effectiveness of the anti-globalization impulses of the "liberal" segment of concerned, vocal and active citizens, who tend to be direct beneficiaries of the second, undemocratic paradigm of globalization. This is a result of living in a North country where our "advantages" are, to a greater or less extent, contingent upon the "disadvantages" of others in the South. Shiva (2002) insists that the "principles of justice, democracy, sovereignty and sustainability" be privileged above "trade, commerce, markets," above "the rules of free trade unregulated by ethics, justice, democracy and ecological limits."

The questions arises, how is it that CSOs / NGOs behave in ways that are supportive of the globalizers-from-above? Leaving aside the unenlightened machinations of the cynical, manipulative globalizers, the primary difficulty seems to be that of critiquing the capitalist world system of which one is part and a primary beneficiary. More fundamentally, the dominant ideology of neo-liberal globalism is hegemonic to the degree that antisystemic movements claiming to be critics of the overall direction of the capitalist world-economy have, over the past 150 years, "essentially turned themselves into fulfillers of the liberal dream" (Wallerstein, 1991, p. 180). Resistance to the "three fundamental institutional supports of global capitalism . . . the TNCs, the transnational capitalist class and the culture-ideology of consumerism" (Sklair, 1995, p. 507) is supported by rediscovering, recovering Freire and *concientização* in the context of his understanding of a critical pedagogy rooted in a social analysis which de-mystifies the deliberately vague, confusing, misleading and a-historical precepts of neo-liberal globalization, and is one of the immediate tasks of the global educator. For Freire, *concientização* is the strategic expression of "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements in reality" (Freire, 1968, p. 19). Freire's position is that while, clearly, "both humanization and dehumanization are possibilities" only humanization is "the

ontological vocation" of humankind; dehumanization as historical reality is essentially a perversion of humanization and is only possible because of the distortions "of an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressors, which in turn dehumanizes the oppressed" (pp. 27-28). The point is that *concientização* is an indispensible "tool" to combat oppression.

Freire (1968) also pointed out that he thought "the fundamental theme of our epoch to be that of domination--which implies its opposite, the theme of liberation, as the objective to be achieved" (p. 93). Liberation is one of the objectives of global education, to the extent that working toward a more just and peaceful world is understood to be liberatory. However, there are various obstacles, or "limit situations," which prevent the attainment of liberation, that is, the realization of the "ontological and historical vocation of all human beings [which] is humanization, or becoming more fully human" (Roberts, 2000, p. 51). The position advanced by proponents of the "world-systems perspective" is that "it would be unrealistic to consider a desirable society anywhere in the world without starting from the all-pervading and dominant nature of the world-system's capitalist reality" (Addo, 1981, pp. 2, 3). Nevertheless, the limit situation for many global educators is that "although the powerful critique [of "late 20th-century developmentalism"[2] developed by the dependency and world-systems literature . . . is widely known, it is commonly ignored" (Samoff, 1996, p. 127). Such critiques have become unacceptable (literally, unthinkable) in an intellectual climate where the ideological hegemony of neoliberal globalism "is so deeply embedded in a society's institutions and practices that it is scarcely noticed, rarely examined, and hardly ever challenged" (p. 145).

The theme and the fact of domination is the foundation of the capitalist world system where, if there were no poor people there could be no rich people. That social inequalities are necessary to the "proper" functioning of this particular approach to social organization is accepted by opponents and supporters of capitalism. The basic points of contention are the degree to which inequality is "functional," when does it become dysfunctional, and whether, ultimately, a system whose "logic" tends toward fantastic material disparities between the "haves" and "have-nots," considers any level of violence acceptable to contain resistance to these disparities, and treats the health of the global environment as optional or incidental, is sustainable. If the current "globalization" is the most recent phase of

---

[2] Samoff (1996, p. 129) describes developmentalism as a combination of a reinvigorated ideology of modernization and the imposition of conditionalities through structural adjustment programs which result in the enforced integration of national economies into the global economic system.

international capitalist expansion, or "neo-liberal globalization," then a further consideration, perhaps not given sufficient emphasis in Freire's work, is the historical context of the "social, political, and economic contradictions" (Mayo, 1996, 1999) in which the project of humanization must be realized. The capacity to understand or contextualize the urgent issues of the day in terms of Fernand Braudel's (1984) conception of the life cycles of historical systems, the *longue durée* of 400 to 500 years of human history, and Frank and Gills (1993) 5000 year world system history, helps us to realize that while each historical moment is unique it is also part of a discernible pattern. There is a direction (desirable-undesirable, intended-unintended), a central tendency in human affairs, toward concentration of power, wealth, influence, control, which is resisted at all points and for often conflicting reasons. By using a time frame which is much longer than the life-span of individual human beings, it is possible to recover perspective on the development of global capitalism, especially advances during the most recent 500 year era which began with the European age of "discoveries" and continues with the current phase of re-discovered or "neo-" liberal globalization, and which is carried forward by the ideology of globalism.

An important consideration is the place of global and adult education in the context of world systems analysis / studies where notions of the self-preservation of society (Polanyi, 1944) combine with the development of critical counter-hegemonic ideologies (Gramsci, Freire) to offer a powerful antidote to the dominant views of social reality advanced by the capitalist / owning / ruling class and its adherents. As Pannu (1996) argues, "neoliberal globalization is a class project" and its agenda

> includes transformations both in the economic and political spheres of national societies and in the international political economy. Decisive shifts in economic and political power in favor of the market (i.e., capital) accompany these transformations. In the context of Third World societies, with few exceptions, not only have the majority of the citizens suffered a loss of power vis-a-vis the political authority, but the popular classes, the poor in particular, have experienced intensified impoverishment. The loss of political power is the result of the remantling of the state in a way that insulates and buffers it from any pressures from below, including segments of the middle classes. The intensified impoverishment is the consequence of a policy-induced decline in real incomes; the deregulation of essential commodity prices; the introduction of indirect tax levies; and the growing privatization of health, education, and other social services. In the name of controlling budget deficits, the costs of essential social services, which the poor can ill afford to pay, have been shifted to users by means of user charges and cost-recovery policies. (p. 99)

The increasingly obvious applicability and relevance of this agenda of neoliberal globalization to Canada and other North countries is not lost on students of global education. However, in order to better understand the contradictions between the dichotomised or polarized positions of the unreconstructed "globalizer" and the fully

committed "transformationist," some discussion of the relationship between global education, global citizenship, and global civil society may be useful. Here, the concept of the law of humanity is central to the understanding of global education.

Global Civil Society

The underlying concern here is, *what is, and what should be, the role of global education in helping to develop the capacities for self-rule, and the necessary civic virtues, required by the global citizen living in the global civil society?* (Welton, 1998, p. 211). Further, what is the role of global civil society in making the law of humanity operative? If one of the fundamental goals or purposes of global education is to alert people to the reasons for differences of opinion and world views in order to be able to engage in rational discussion; in order to be able to make some attempt to understand issues and their root causes and work toward meaningful, participatory resolution of these (Stuart, 1996), then, this corresponds reasonably well with the purposes accorded to "cosmopolitan democracy" by Archibugi & Held (1995): "what the cosmopolitan model proposes is, in the end, simply the creation of the appropriate institutions where citizens of the planet may discuss the problems and take the decisions that shape their destiny" (p. 157). Cosmopolitan democracy is central to the concept of the law of humanity, and is thought to be one of the central concerns of global civil society, and hence a central aim of global education for global citizenship.

First, then, a look at some ways of understanding the concept of civil society. There are different views of civil society. It is seen as a process which embodies the collaborative and confrontational nature of state-civil society relations; including Gramsci's observation that the short-run state objective of coopting civil society creates long-run problems. There is considerable disagreement about the nature, extent, and even the utility of the concept of civil society, however, a UN definition is helpful in defining some acceptable limits:

> this term covers a multitude of institutions, voluntary associations and networks - women's groups, trade unions, chambers of commerce, farming or housing cooperatives, neighborhood watch associations, religion-based organizations, and so on. Such groups channel the interests and energies of many communities outside government, from business and the professions to individuals working for the welfare of children or a healthier planet . . . . non-governmental organizations and movements . . . . citizens' movements and NGOs . . . .

> Growing awareness of the need for popular participation in governance, combined with disenchantment with the performance of governments and recognition of their limited capabilities has contributed to the growth of NGOs. The proliferation of these groups broadens effective representation, and can enhance pluralism and the functioning of democracy. Civil society organizations have attained impressive legitimacy in many countries. Yet, some governments and powerful interests remain

suspicious of independent organizations, and issues of legitimacy and accountability will continue to arise everywhere as assessments of the NGO sector become more careful and nuanced. (Commission on Global Governance, 1995, pp. 32-33)

A recent CCIC (2002) Background Paper agrees that civil society is defined in a number of ways. A useful working definition, which identifies the terrain occupied by the groups and organizations interested and involved in some of the same concerns and issues as TEN DAYS, is taken in part from a CIVICUS definition of civil society where
'Civil society is a representation of collective citizen action, whether to advance mutual interests, solve common problems, or promote shared aspirations. Civil society and its organizations provide an alternative means for citizens to participate in designing and creating healthy public life in their own image'. Civil society includes diverse and often contending organizations of citizens, inter-acting based on their perception of the common good, excluding those whose actions threaten the basic rights of others (e.g. promoting exclusion based on race, religion, ethnicity or gender). While distinct from the state and private sector actors, civil society initiatives often include forms of collaboration with these actors. CCIC members include a diverse selection of Canadian civil society organizations involved in international cooperation -- faith, NGOs, trade unions, environment and women's organizations. (footnote 1, pp. 9-10)

One striking feature of this NGO phenomenon has been its rapid growth in recent times. The size of the "space," that "large and loosely bounded zone falling between organized sovereign authority and the family unit," (Young, 1994, p. 44) which civil society seeks to occupy, is immense. The struggle for control of this zone by the forces of globalization-from-above and the forces of globalization-from-below is critically important.

Also in the earlier document prepared by the Commission on Global Governance (1995), there is some relevant discussion of "a global Charter of Civil Society" which would provide a "basis for progress in building a more civil global society." This Charter would formalize "a global ethic of common rights and shared responsibilities. . . .reinforcing the fundamental rights that are already part of the fabric of international norms." The Charter would minimally include the rights of all people to:
1. a secure life,
2. equitable treatment,
3. an opportunity to earn a fair living and provide for their own welfare,
4. the definition and preservation of their differences through peaceful means,
5. participation in governance at all levels,
6. free and fair petition for redress of gross injustices,
7. equal access to information, and
8. equal access to the global commons.

The responsibilities of all people would include the shared obligation to:
1. contribute to the common good,
2. consider the impact of their actions on the security and welfare of others,

3. promote equity, including gender equity,
4. protect the interests of future generations by pursuing sustainable development and safeguarding the global commons,
5. preserve humanity's cultural and intellectual heritage,
6. be active participants in governance, and
7. work to eliminate corruption. (pp. 56-57)

The mandate of global civil society, in one view then, is to actively work toward what has been called Cosmopolitan Democracy, and to activate the Law of Humanity. In this context, Archibugi (1995) informs us that the goal of cosmopolitan democracy, or "what the cosmopolitan model proposes is, in the end, simply the creation of the appropriate institutions where citizens of the planet may discuss the problems and take the decisions that shape their destiny" (p. 157). The law of humanity is, simply, based on "treating each person on earth as a sacred subject" (Falk, 1995, p. 172).

Others have argued that to a great extent the entire debate about civil society, global civil society, is a deliberate exercise in obscurantism and serves only to mystify those who want to find some explanation for the degree to which the implementation of the Law of Humanity is frustrated at every turn. An important illustration is the ways in which critics of globalization "have been side tracked from the struggle for state power by the rhetoric of 'civil society' and notion that 'the nation-state is an anachronism'." Furthermore,

> Attitudes towards globalization are clearly defined by structural position and distributive consequences: globalization and its universal appeals are grounded in mystifying its profound class roots and class inequalities. Globalization's continuing powerful ties to the nation-state and the ruling classes within those states contradict its appeal to universalism and abstract nationalism (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 34).

Exalting civil society at the expense of the "supposedly weak or anachronistic state" can be useful to the advocates of neo-liberal globalization for several reasons: (1) to disarm their critics, to discourage oppositional forces from creating an alternative to globalist-dominated capital; (2) to disorient the political struggle, for if not over the state, which is now supposedly non-existent, what could the struggle be about? (3) to encourage political and social groups to operate in the interstices of the dominant system, but on a small scale (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 55).

In this context of citizenship, civil society and the democratic process, an important distinction must be made between "formal" and "substantive" citizenship:

> *Formal citizenship* refers to the legal attributes attached to a citizen according to a written or unwritten constitution. *Substantive citizenship* refers to the capacity of individuals to exercise those powers in actual debate and in the resolution of political issues. Today, citizens are systematically denied the right to address and vote on the

most profound and substantive issues that affect their lives, including state spending, taxation, privatization, austerity programs and subsidies for TNCs. To cover up this denial of citizenship, elitist defenders of the liberal state refer to amorphous notions of 'civil society' and 'globalization'. (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, pp. 70-71)

Civil society includes both the powerful and the marginalized, where the elites make the decisions to which others adapt, sometimes resist. The lesson here is that

> the concept of 'civil society' is too general and inclusive to explain the divisive economic policies generated by one class in society against another. The exercise of substantive citizenship is closely associated with a class politics that recognizes the distinctive and unequal relations within civil society and the interlocking relations between dominant classes in civil society and the state. (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 71)

Global Citizenship

Nevertheless, the concepts of global citizenship and global civil society are useful. The persistent question remains as to what they are precisely, and how they function in the face of initiatives sponsored or promoted by the WTO and the growing awareness of the influence of the G7 / 8-IMF-WB-WTO complex and its implications for global education and global citizenship. Thus, a two-fold challenge for global educators is to recognize the weaknesses in the concept of civil society and the concurrent existence of countless NGOs, civil society organizations (CSOs), and others worldwide for whom this way of seeing and understanding social reality has genuine meaning.

An examination of global citizenship in the context of global civil society, and the struggle between rule of the corporation and rule of the people reveals that the contest is largely between proponents of the law of humanity as embodied in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (1949) and the law of the market. In the law of the market, "privatization" is a key strategy in the globalization process. An understanding of it is central to deciphering the rhetoric of "market rationality" and "free enterprise" or "free trade." On one view, it is

> part of a global strategy which has its roots in an attack on civil society and democratic politics . . . . whose priority is to ram through transfers of property that will make the transition to neoliberal capitalism irreversible. Privatization is essentially a political act, having little or no 'intrinsic value' as a national economic strategy and certainly not adding anything to the creation of new jobs, higher rates of savings and investment, or new productive forces . . . . [it is] not principally a means of taking over enterprises and penetrating markets so much as it is a means of eliminating alternative structures of production which could compete or challenge an imperially dominated world.
>
> . . . The irony is that the convergence of the 'market' rhetoric of the imperial banks at the top and the 'civil society' ideology of the NGOs at the bottom undermines

collective struggles for social change and a positive role for the national state. (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2000, p. 93)

A further consequence or function of "privatization rhetoric," in promoting the view that the state is withering away and that CSOs are ready and able to assume the responsibilities formerly undertaken by the state, is that this "ideology of antistatism" disguises the reality which is that of simply diverting "state intervention from financing public welfare to funding private elites . . . . a new kind of statism in which privatization [is] financed and organized by the state for the benefit of the private sector" (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 100). It is part of "remantling" the state which Pannu (1996) described.

In the context of strategies of resistance to globalization-from-above, advocates, adversaries and "ambivalents" respond differently to privatization rhetoric. It is important, therefore, to take into consideration certain further assumptions about the historical and potential behavior of the principal advocates and proponents of globalization. These advocates include powerful economic interests within both the hegemonic and subordinate states -- especially "agro-business and financial groups, importers, mineral exporters, and big manufacturers for export markets or subcontracted sweatshop owners" as well as "high-level state functionaries (self-styled technocrats), academics and publicists linked to the international circuits" whose function is to "manufacture the theories and concepts that can be used to justify and prescribe globalist programs, strategies and tactics." Add to this category of globalizers "key elements of the dominant capitalist class -- bankers, financiers, and importers and exporters of goods and services" and this "bloc" with few "ties to local producers, tend to be staunch advocates of globalist principles of free trade" (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 32).

It should also be noted that more traditionally "liberal" supporters of NGOs / CSOs, social justice movements and organizations, tend to hold unrealistic views of the extreme measures which globalizers-from-above will employ to achieve their ends. Although advocates of globalization derive much of their power from their privileged positions and control of trade, investment and financial resources, "social power and mass organization are also potentially crucial sources of political power" (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 32). This is an important point as it relates to TEN DAYS and popular movements of worker and peasants, worldwide; both in poor and increasingly in rich countries. As a counterbalance, there are the vast number of adversaries of globalization, sometimes including many who are ambivalent about the benefits (to them) of globalization. The effect of competition from cheap imports on local producers, the increased use of labour-saving technology on large

private land holdings which further impoverishes landless peasants who depend on wage labor for survival, and elimination or reduction of specialty crops (particularly hemp, coca and poppies which serve the lucrative niche markets of North countries) has embittered and radicalized large numbers of people.

In addition to workers in North and South countries who have mobilized, public employees worldwide who have been affected tend to oppose globalization as do small business and many local producers. The ambivalent classes or group consists of certain industries and manufacturers still requiring protection from the global marketplace, low-paid workers who depend on cheap imports to extend their purchasing power, and peasant families who lose family members due to migratory pressures, face loss of income because of cheap imports, yet benefit from remittances of relatives abroad. Notice that

> What are decisive in the swing of these sectors are political intervention, organization and struggle. When the globalist classes are in command, the ambivalent classes adapt to rather than resist globalist encroachments. When the subordinate classes are in ascendancy, the 'ambivalents' join in civic strikes, increase demands for state protection and favour regulation of sweatshops and assembly plants. (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 33)

Transformative Global Education

Here, the value and importance of a transformative global education can be seen. At the end of the day, both objective class position and location in dominant or dominated countries can be seen to be good, but far-from-perfect, predictors or indicators of one's subjective allegiance or position vis-a-vis globalization; as advocate, adversary or ambivalent.

However, the essential point is the differential in levels of organization:

> the international networks that link competing advocates and exploited adversaries are unevenly developed. The advocates have their own international forums and organizations and act in common, but the exploited adversaries remain fragmented. There is a gap between the structural affinities of the adversaries and their subjective dispersion. A key point is *the control of the nation-state by the advocates and beneficiaries and their capacity to wield it as a formidable weapon in creating conditions for global expansion.* The weakness of the adversaries is in part organizational -- opposition is built around sectoral demands without strong international ties and ideological commitments. Adversaries have been side-tracked from the struggle for state power by the rhetoric of 'civil society' and the notion that 'the nation-state is an anachronism'. (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 34)

The position of global education in general, and TEN DAYS in particular, is not that the state is an anachronism, quite the contrary. To the extent, however, that the state has been abandoned to the (neo-liberal) globalizers-from-above by proponents of a civil society approach to global governance, there are serious implications to be drawn from this

perspective.

In the context of a study of the role of popular movements in resisting and reshaping the agenda of neo-liberal globalism and challenging or questioning the sustainability of the globalization-from-above approach to global governance, an immediate focus for TEN DAYS and global education is the role of the IFIs in advancing the agenda of the capitalist class. One graphic way of visualizing patterns of control which appear to be unsustainable in contemporary global socio-economic and political reality is to understand that states in much of the world strongly resemble huge concentration camps of de facto prisoners ("citizens") who are prohibited from leaving, permitted to own little or no personal or productive property, have limited access to a shrinking commons, have no voice in decisions as to how the state is organized or managed, and must work (or starve) to pay the odious debts to global capital incurred by illegitimate leaders who work for, or are part of, the global capitalist class, and who continue to skim both ways -- from incoming loans and outgoing debt repayments (Ikeda, 2002).

The functions of international financial institutions (IFIs), including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and international trade regulators (the World Trade Organization - WTO) in advancing the agenda of neoliberal globalism are well understood, as is the reality that the financially (and militarily) powerful states which make up the G7 (and sometimes G8[3]) dominate these organizations. In the face of this powerful conglomeration of special interests the special appeal of global education is to be found, in part, in the unique ways in which the Freirean approach to *concientização* (understanding the world as it is--realism) is combined with the idealism of being able to imagine, even see, the world as it should be and can be, and developing and using tools, methods, strategies, tactics to work toward that non-violent future world. For the global educator a major concern is about ways in which requirements for social and economic justice are subverted, not least of which includes education. Here, one important aspect of education is the crucial role it plays in advancing the project of neo-liberal globalism to the extent that it assumes a level of ideological hegemony. Hence, an important task for the global educator is to continue in the path which I suggest that Ten Days for Global Justice (and other research and education coalitions of which Canadian churches and other NGOs / CSOs have been part) embarked upon more than thirty years ago and which has become ever more important in these early years of the 21st century. Cognizant of the hegemonic power of the dominant

---

[3] United States, Germany, Japan, Great Britain, France, Italy, Canada (and sometimes Russia)

ideology of neo-liberal globalism, global education seeks to build a counter-hegemonic ideology based on the notions of solidarity and "deep democracy," a participatory and engaged approach to local and global government. In this respect, TEN DAYS has explicitly addressed the often-identified problem of the domestication and distortion of Freire's pedagogy and

> failing to consider Freire's work in its social context, fragmentation in reading his texts, and reductionism in appropriating Freirean concepts, principles, and practices are especially common. To counter these possibilities . . . Freire should be read contextually, holistically, and critically (Roberts, 2000, pp. 7-8).

A concrete and hopeful example of the impulse toward the self-protection of the society is found in Polanyi (1944) where the convergence of interests has unanticipated consequences. Further positive action can be taken in recognizing the class-based nature of the struggle, and attempting in realistic (not wilfully naive) ways to transcend inherent difficulties posed when numerically-powerful CSOs and NGOs challenge the financially-powerful capitalists and their supporters. As well, recognizing the growing threat to human and planetary survival posed by the neo-liberal globalizing agenda and the degree to which TEN DAYS (NGO / CSO) initiatives are being co-opted by this agenda is very important. As we see from increasingly acrimonious exchanges between CCIC and CIDA, the apparent cooptation of OXFAM, the drafting of a New Africa Partnership plan which is structural adjustment revisited, the tension between paradigms of globalization is growing. Pannu's (1996) discussion of "remantling the state" under the neo-liberal project of globalization, and the class project of globalization can be counterposed to the on-going exposure to Freirean liberatory and emancipatory education in context of Gramscian notions of ideological hegemony under contemporary neo-liberal "globalism" (Mayo, 1996, 1999; Allman, 1999, 2001). The influence of the project of liberation theology and Freirean emancipatory education on the growth of TEN DAYS is affirmative and promising. This Canadian approach to development education, rooted in a humanistic concern for the dispossessed, combined with a thoughtful, rational analysis of social reality from the perspective of biblically-inspired demands for social and economic justice is a model for development and global education in Canada.

The growing awareness of the relevance of issues which global education seeks to address, leads to questions about the ways in which we have grown accustomed to viewing and understanding the world. TEN DAYS has been part of the approach to reading the *word* in order that we might read the *world*.

Chapter Three: Research Methods

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the approach taken in this study to identifying the kinds of information required, appropriate sources, methods and instruments for collecting data, and ways of organizing and summarizing information, interpreting the results, and reporting outcomes. Consulting the professional literature on global and development education, books, periodicals, and reports provided guidance to the research problem and the rationale for the study, data collection methods, data organization and analysis, and interpretation and reporting (Thomas, 1998, p. 73).

Qualitative Orientation

A qualitative research methodology was used in the study, because "the strengths of qualitative research derive primarily from its inductive approach, its focus on specific situations or people, and its emphasis on words rather than numbers" (Maxwell, 1996, p. 17). The research purposes which call for qualitative studies, generally, include: to understand the *meaning* - the participants' perspective of the events, situations, and actions they are involved with and of the accounts they give of their lives and experiences; to understand the particular *context* within which the participants act, and the influence this context has on their actions; to identify *unanticipated* phenomena and influences - exploratory qualitative studies; to understand the *process* by which events and actions take place; and to develop causal explanations (pp. 17-20). This study generally meets these critera and the requirements that qualitative research or qualitative studies: are field focused; rely on the self as research instrument; are interpretive in character; rely on the use of expressive language and the presence of voice in the text; attend to particulars; and become believable and instructive because of their coherence, insight, and instrumental utility (Janesick, 1998, p. 8).

This study also meets some, but not all, of the criteria for a qualitative research case study, which is described as an "in depth analysis of one or more bounded systems, such as events, programs, communities, settings, schools, individuals, and social groups" (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 6). It is "an investigation of one entity, which is carefully defined and placed within a specific context," this entity may be a system, and "typically, observations, interviews, and document reviews are used to collect data" (p. 120). The purpose of the case study is "to describe, explain, or evaluate particular social phenomena" and to discover "constructs, themes, and patterns" (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1999, pp. 289, 291). Key characteristics of case study research are identified as in depth "study of a phenomenon by focusing on a case" in a natural context where "representation of both the emic

[researcher's] and etic [participants'] perspectives" are recorded and reported (pp. 292-293).

In the context of this study, it meets the standards (Thomas, 1998, pp. 8-25) of being a description of Ten Days for Global Justice as a movement within an institution and the perceptions of selected participants, it is a study of an ongoing educational event including examination of program and resource materials and limited participation in events, activities, and local meetings. The study is historical and descriptive, including explanation and evaluation while looking at changes in the program from its inception to the present. However, active researcher involvement in the organization was limited and the study was bound to a specific number of interviews in a particular place, Edmonton, and time, the year 2000. No attempt was made to use (participant) observation as a data-gathering tool (McMillan & Wergin, 2000, p. 120; Thomas, 1998, p. 12), nor were any interviews conducted with former TEN DAYS participants.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994) describe qualitative research as a type of research which is "multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach [and] the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials," including interviews and archival materials (pp. 2-3). The field is "interdisciplinary," "multi-paradigmatic in focus," uses "multi-method approaches," and practitioners "are committed to the naturalist perspective, and to the interpretive understanding of human experience. At the same time, the field is inherently political and shaped by multiple ethical and political positions" (pp. 3-4).

Qualitative research is understood differently by different people but there is agreement that it conforms to an approach where the
> data collected have been termed *soft,* that is rich in description of people, places, and conversations, and not easily handled by statistical procedures. Research questions are not framed by operationalizing variables; rather, they are formulated to investigate topics in all their complexity, in context. While people conducting qualitative research may develop a focus as they collect data, they do not approach the research with specific questions to answer or hypotheses to test (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 2).

The influence of ideological and political practices in the reasons for doing research, and in the conduct of that research, are reflected in basic considerations of who studies whom? the nature of power relationships, and, of course, funding. There are growing
> indications that over the years, qualitative methods have been useful for and attractive to researchers who have been excluded from, or who are studying the perspectives of people excluded from the mainstream . . . . [these] have been attracted to qualitative research because of the democratic emphasis of the method, the ease with

which the method attends to the perspectives of those not traditionally included in the mainstream research studies, and the strengths of the qualitative approach for describing the complexities of social conflicts (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, pp. 14-15).

Likewise, others have observed that, of late, "some qualitative researchers have abandoned the pretence of neutrality and developed research that is openly ideological and has an empowering and democratizing purpose" (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 3).

Interest in, and recognition of the value of, qualitative research for education began to build in the 1960's as educational problems, particularly those experienced by minority children, gained recognition. The notion was being challenged that the only perceptions of any value in society were those of persons in power. Other ideological strands influencing the way in which people think about and do qualitative research are feminism, postmodernism and critical theory. Postmodernist sociologists and anthropologists place more emphasis on "interpretation and writing as central features of research." Critical theorists, on the other hand, are "critical of social organization that privileges some at the expense of others. . . . [and those] who do qualitative research are very interested in issues of gender, race, and class because they consider these the prime means for differentiating power in this society." Questions related to social reproduction are often raised by researchers. The influences of these ideological perspectives varies, depending on individual researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, pp.16-22).

Qualitative research "crosscuts disciplines, fields, and subject matter;" it is used in education, social work, communications, psychology, history, organizational studies, medical science, anthropology and sociology, and there are patterns which have emerged in the development of qualitative research during the twentieth century (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 2). There is agreement that some of the major characteristics of qualitative research include: concern for context, natural setting, human instrument, descriptive data, emergent design, inductive analysis (Ary, et al., 2002, pp. 424-426). One of the fundamental assumptions of qualitative studies is that reality is subjective, depending on individual perceptions and interpretations of their experiences. Characteristics of qualitative studies include: the search for meaning, constructed reality, natural settings, rich narrative description, direct data collection, concern with process, inductive data analysis, participant perspectives, and emergent research design (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 119).

The constant comparative method of qualitative data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was used in this nonexperimental study which relied on participants' oral responses to a series

of interview questions about the program. Some suggest that the constant comparative method is most suitable to theory development in the context of grounded theory, where "theory is developed through a process of *constant comparison,* in which emerging ideas and themes are continually 'tested' with new data" (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 121). Another view is that the constant comparative method is well-adapted to qualitative data analysis more generally. Using this method, the researcher

> combines inductive category coding with simultaneous comparison of all units of meaning obtained . . . . examines each new unit of meaning (topics or concepts) to determine its distinctive characteristics. Then compare categories and group them with similar categories. If there are no similar units of meaning, form a new category. Thus there is a process of continuous refinement; initial categories may be changed, merged, or omitted; new categories are generated; and new relationships can be discovered. (Ary, et al., 2002, pp. 467, 469)

Finally, I think it is accurate to categorize this study as both interactive and noninteractive qualitative research, where the data, in the first instance, are collected directly from study participants through interviews and, in the latter, through consulting and reviewing documents (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 120).

Data Collection

The specific techniques and instruments of data collection were:

> (1) In-depth interviews, with a purposive sample of six key organizers and leaders of Ten Days; and

> (2) Analysis of documents obtained from Ten Days, including reports, minutes of meetings, conference proceedings, brochures, press statements, earlier studies and evaluations of the program.

Sampling

The choice of in-depth interviews, with a purposive sample of six key organizers and leaders of TEN DAYS, was determined by the nature of the study which was seeking answers to questions about the program which could be addressed best by active, knowledgeable participants who could provide accurate information (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 121). Another view of purposive or judgment sampling is that it is the process of choosing "sample elements judged to be typical or representative" of the entire population and one of the dangers or limitations of this approach is that the sample will not be representative (Ary, et al, 2002, pp. 169-170). In the case of this study, the intent in drawing the sample was to find people who were not representative, in that they were more than usually active in TEN DAYS, they displayed more and longer term commitment to the program, and possessed unusual knowledge of the intended purposes of the program.

Sample selection was on the basis of potential participant's depth of knowledge of the history, development and current direction of TEN DAYS, PLURA church affiliation, experience with local, regional and national level committees, generally, people with extensive active involvement in TEN DAYS at various levels. Insofar as possible, selection was also intended to reflect the demographic characteristics of the overall population of TEN DAYS participants. First, we note that "TEN DAYS represents the mainstream demographic profile of the churches" (Reeve & Allan, 2000, p. 31). On the basis of results from an on-line and mail-in survey, with 128 responses, the researchers found that, specifically, within TEN DAYS, 73% of participants are female, 27% male; 52% of participants are over 50 years of age, 36% are 30-50 years of age, 2% under 30. Of those 50 or older, 79% are women, and 74% in the 30-50 age category. Hence, three-quarters of the participants in TEN DAYS across Canada are women, the majority of whom are in their mid-forties and older.

The Reeve & Allan (2000) study showed that the median age of all participants was 55, and the mean number of years of involvement with TEN DAYS was 11.5 years. However, "well over one-third of respondents were under 50 and one-quarter have become involved in the past five years," indicating strengthening of a move toward membership renewal (p. 4). Eighty-two percent of participants are actively involved in their local church communities, 13 % somewhat involved.

Over 50 % of the participants were affiliated with the United Church of Canada, 20% with the Roman Catholic Church, 13 % Anglican and about 5% for each Presbyterian and Lutheran adherents. The lay : clergy ratio amongst participants was 69% : 24%.

There was a high degree of participation and action
> Jubilee petition, Close the Gap, and fair trade coffee have all engaged over 80% of respondents, with the Jubilee pledge and letters on the federal budget also involving significant numbers. Those actions perceived as 'doable', with clear links to personal experience, and potential to influence government or corporate policy gain the strongest support. (p. 15)

Reeve & Allan (2000) also found that
> For a majority of respondents, the aspect of the program viewed as most important is the links created between local and global issues. This is backed in naming as principles strong concern for partnership, solidarity, collaboration and networking. It seems that participants in TEN DAYS increasingly perceive justice work as one task, and recognize themselves as part of a global citizens movement resisting the effects of globalization, restructuring and economic injustice in every part of the world. (p. 19)

A preference for the importance of youth involvement as a priority was evident, as well as an emphasis on both the ecumenical and grassroots nature of TEN DAYS and the importance of using the program as a means of strengthening congregations: "The resources provided by TEN DAYS are key for a number of people in keeping global justice issues before the churches, and offering congregations members ways to integrate worship, education and action in relation to them" (pp. 19-20).

The characteristics of the study sample here were reasonably reflective of the characteristics of TEN DAYS participants identified by Reeve & Allan (2000) except that no clergy were available during the time interviews were being conducted, and the "typical" representation from members churches did not obtain in Edmonton and area. United Church members are under represented in the sample, and members of the Lutheran Church are over represented, while no Roman Catholic, Presbyterian or Anglican Church members were interviewed. Five females and one male were finally available for interviews; one female age 30-40, three females age 40-50, one female and one male age 50 plus. All participants were married with children (at home and/or adult), mostly from professional occupations or training, with some small business background. All had long-term TEN DAYS involvement at local and regional levels; four had substantial past and/or current involvement at the national level. All participants are actively involved in their local church communities and in substantial agreement with the important aspects, principles, and priorities found by Reeve & Allan (2000) and, as indicated in subsequent interviews, they agree with the "difference that participation in ecumenical justice work has made in their lives" and that the organizational challenges reported (p. 32) accurately reflect their views.

The sample is fairly representative of the demographic profile of TEN DAYS participants identified by Reeve & Allan (2000) but the question remains as to how representative the respondents to that survey actually are of the overall "average" member of the program and the sponsoring churches in general. To the extent they do not fit the profile of the membership of the mainline churches in Canada, participants are likely to be biased in favour of the program, its goals, objectives. This might be considered a limitation of the study.

Organizing the Interviews

The interview process was initiated through a combination of using contacts introduced by two University of Alberta professors, Dr. S. H. Toh and Dr. Virginia Floresca-Cawagas, who have been involved in TEN DAYS activities, and my acquaintance with social justice

activists in the Edmonton area, as well as earlier involvement with the TEN DAYS program. By making general inquiries among some well-connected social justice actors in Edmonton as to who to contact regarding in-depth, up-to-date information regarding the status of the TEN DAYS program, one name emerged consistently and that person became the first contact, the first interviewee. At that point the interview schedule had its first test-run and performed well. On the basis of recommendations from this participant, ten other possible interview participants in the Edmonton area were identified who met the criteria of being currently active in the program, and having substantial commitment, involvement, and knowledge of TEN DAYS--roots, development, history, and current situation. Subsequently, potential interview participants were contacted and arrangements made for interviews, using University of Alberta, Faculty of Education, Global and International Education, names of previous contacts, all as entry points, points of reference. As much explanation as necessary was made in order to secure commitment to an interview, then the interview schedule was sent ahead. At the interview copies of the project description, the interview schedule, the guarantee of confidentiality, and letter of consent were distributed (see Appendix).

Interview Procedures

With the consent of the participants, or "key informants, the interviews were tape-recorded and lasted from one and one-half to two hours. In order to explain the purpose and nature of the research to participants each participant received a letter with complete details explaining the purpose and nature of the research: (1) the overall goals and procedures of the study; (2) expected length of each interview; and (3) an outline of the procedures related to the Ethics of Research following University of Alberta guidelines and guarantees of participant confidentiality. Verbal explanation was also provided, with the opportunity for questions, clarification and feedback. The informed consent of each participant was obtained by the Letter of Consent to Participate from each participant, as well as verbally prior to each interview. The interview schedule was distributed to participants in advance of each interview so they were able to think about their responses ahead of time and spend more or less time discussing issues of particular interest or concern, as they saw the need. The design of the interview schedule was intended to set the parameters or boundaries of the interview with specific questions and participants had the opportunity to digress or expand their responses as desired, keeping within the overall focus of the interview. The interviews were clearly and intentionally structured, with ample opportunity for additional information or comments.

Participants were informed, both by letter and verbally, of their right to opt out of the study at any time with no negative consequences. Participants were also advised that any information collected to the point at which they might wish to opt out of the interview or the overall study would not be used, unless consent to do so was obtained. Each interview was immediately transcribed, verbatim, and a copy returned to the participant in question for comments, changes, additions or deletions, and final confirmation of permission to use the material.

No individual study participant has been identified by name. Confidentiality was guaranteed and pseudonyms were assigned. In this case, study participants were known to one another; the Ten Days community is a close-knit one, especially at the level of key organizers and program leaders. However, the written report is free of any attribution of opinion, comment or observation. Each participant received a signed guarantee of confidentiality. Materials, tapes, interview notes, anything of a confidential nature was kept safe from possible risks to security. At the end of the study, these materials were destroyed and all interview tapes erased. The transcripts of the interviews are on file and will be retained for the seven year period required by the University of Alberta.

The confidentiality of participants has been preserved and information pertaining to persons was generalized. The disposal of study notes and tape recordings of interviews ensured that no threat or harm came to study participants. Clarity on the issue of participants' unqualified right to opt out of the study at any time, without prejudice, also helped to avoid any problems of threat or harm to participants or to others.

There were no research assistants involved in the study. All data collection and transcription of recorded interviews were done by the researcher and there has been no secondary use of data.

For reasons of time and availability, five more in-depth interviews were conducted, one of which was not recorded and occurred in a less formal or structured atmosphere one evening at a regional training event. The interviews were largely structured; one and a half to two hours in length, and extensive field notes were taken during the interviews. The respondents were not pushed to answer questions they were not comfortable with, whether because of lack of knowledge, interest, or experience. Rather, people were encouraged to elaborate on issues, concerns, questions which they found especially important. Follow-up interviews might have been useful but circumstances intervened, the restructuring issue overtook the

participants. Now TEN DAYS is part of KAIROS and the current situation could be another study.

The use of a structured interview schedule, with specific questions while encouraging additional comments and observations, had the desired effect of engaging participants to discuss an important, interesting and meaningful aspect of their lives. None of the participants felt the need to go beyond the framework of the interview schedule, although each displayed individual preferences or interests about different aspects of the program. In this case, the questions seemed to be good, that is, they were focused, the content engaged the interviewees, and there was sufficient latitude for them to elaborate on particular points of interest as desired.

The choice of the interview as instrument for data collection is appropriate insofar as it helps to establish an attitude of respect and interest, both for the study and for the participant. Interviews are time consuming and inconvenient, for both researcher and interviewee, however, evidence of interest and commitment on the part of the researcher transmits itself to participants by alerting them to the importance of the project. The interview process allows for clarification of questions, amplification of responses including digression as warranted, and "can provide an in-depth understanding of respondents' motives, patterns of reasoning, and emotional reactions not possible with questionnaires" (Thomas, 1998, pp. 133-134). Furthermore, attention to ethical considerations is at once an obligation contingent upon the researcher and an indication of the importance of the project. Attention must be given to proper research protocol, including confidentiality regarding the kinds of information obtained, the researcher's relationship to participants, informed consent, harm, reciprocation, and getting permission to conduct research, as well as the fundamental principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice (Ary, et al., 2002, pp. 437-439).

Document Analysis

Documents consulted for the study included the annual TEN DAYS resource materials, study guides, facilitators' guides, evaluation studies (Stone, 1985; Reeve & Allan, 2000), commentaries and articles by TEN DAYS staff, and Larson's (1988) major study of the programme.

Validity and Reliability

In evaluating the credibility of qualitative research, validity and reliability are important considerations. Validity refers to the appropriateness of inferences and reliability to

possible error in collecting information (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 10). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research differ somewhat from quantitative approaches to social research, where "validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the inferences a researcher makes. Reliability refers to the consistency of scores or answers from one administration of an instrument to another, and from one set of items to another" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996, p. 154). This view of validity and reliability does not lend itself well to understanding these issues in the context of qualitative research, where the central concern is "the degree of confidence researchers can place in what they have seen or heard [and where]

> validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the inferences researchers make based on the data they collect, while reliability refers to the consistency of these inferences over time. . . . qualitative researchers use a number of techniques . . . to check their perceptions in order to ensure that they are not being misinformed - that they are, in effect, seeing (and hearing) what they think they are. . . . procedures for checking on or enhancing validity and reliability (pp. 461-462).

There are two specific validity threats to guard against: researcher bias, "the selection of data that fit the researcher's existing theory or preconceptions and the selection of data that 'stand out' to the researcher;" and reactivity, "the influence of the researcher on the setting or individuals studied." It is possible to control for the effect of the researcher but not to eliminate it, and this effect is much more important in interviews than in participant observation studies (Maxwell, 1996, p. 91).

Kvale (1996) speaks of three communities of validation. First, the interviewee, who is asked for an opinion regarding the validity of one or many of the investigator's interpretations. Second, the general public which decides "whether the documentation and the argumentation are convincing." And third, the theoretical community: "when a statement is interpreted within a theoretical context, the validity of the interpretation will depend on whether the theory is valid for the area studied, and whether the specific interpretations follow logically from the theory" (pp. 217-218).

In his discussion of the social construction of validity, Kvale (1996) examines "the issue of how to get beyond the extremes of a subjective relativism where everything can mean anything, and an absolutist quest for the one and only true, objective meaning" (p. 229). Some qualitative researchers dismiss the concepts of generalizability, reliability and validity. Others, "have gone beyond the relativism of a rampant antipositivism and have reclaimed ordinary language terms to discuss the truth value of their findings, using concepts such as trustworthiness, credibility, dependability, and confirmability." Kvale's "approach is not to

reject the concepts . . . but to reconceptualize them in forms relevant to interview research" (p. 231).

Kvale (1996) continues his discussion of validity as one of the qualities of craftsmanship, observing that "the craftsmanship and credibility of the researcher [are] essential." He has found three aspects of "validation as investigation," including *to validate is to question* and to *validate is to theorize,* where "the complexities of validating qualitative research need not be due to an inherent weakness in qualitative methods, but may on the contrary rest on their extraordinary power to picture and to question the complexity of the social reality investigated" (p. 244). However, the most interesting, for present purposes, is the notion that *to validate is to check.* As supporting evidence, he cites Miles & Huberman (1994), who

> emphasize that there are no canons or infallible decision-making rules for establishing the validity of qualitative research. Their approach is to analyze the many sources of potential biases that might invalidate qualitative observations and interpretations . . . tactics for testing and confirming qualitative findings . . . . checking for representativeness and for researcher effects, triangulating, weighing the evidence, checking the meaning of outliers, using extreme cases, following up on surprises, looking for negative evidence, making if-then tests, ruling our spurious relations, replicating a finding, checking our rival explanations, and getting feedback from informants (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 263, in Kvale, 1996, p. 243).

Generalizability and generalization in qualitative research are closely related to, and follow from, issues of validity and reliability. Generalization is "a statement or claim of some sort that applies to more than one individual, group, object or situation.

> . . . The value of a generalization is that it allows us to have expectations (and sometimes to make predictions) about the future. . . . generalization is possible in qualitative research . . . . but it is much more likely that any generalizing to be done will be by interested practitioners - by individuals who are in situations similar to the one(s) investigated by the researcher. It is the practitioner, rather than the researcher, who judges the applicability of the researcher's findings and conclusions, who determines whether the researcher's findings fit his or her situation (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996, pp. 464-465).

Generalizability is also of somewhat limited value in qualitative research where the event or condition of interest is local, specific, or in some ways unique, and the selection of a purposive, judgmental or theoretical sampling technique precludes it from the outset. The distinction is useful between internal generalizability "of a conclusion *within* the setting or group studied," and external generalizability "beyond that setting or group . . . .[however] The value of a qualitative study may depend on its *lack* of external generalizability . . . it may provide an account of a setting or population that is illuminating as an extreme case or ideal type" (Maxwell, 1996, pp. 96-97). It may be some comfort to know that these issues

of validity are resolved when

> the quality of the craftsmanship results in products with knowledge claims that are so powerful and convincing in their own right they, so to say, carry the validation with them . . . . In such cases, the research procedures would be transparent and the results evident, and the conclusion of the study intrinsically convincing as true, beautiful, and good. Appeals to external certification, or official validity stamps of approval, then become secondary. Valid research would in this sense be research that makes questions of validity superfluous (Kvale, 1996, p. 252).

Thus, validity in qualitative research becomes internal validity, and credibility is central.

Data Analysis

Discussion of the study findings and conclusions is an opportunity where the "researcher evaluates the findings in light of the methodology to explain what the results mean and how they can be used" (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 12). From the literature review and subsequent data collectection, answering the research questions to the extent possible, the initial questions of how TEN DAYS approached the problems and concerns of development and global education, will be the objective. The questions are answered from the perspective of how the data may be critically understood based on the intersection of three data sources: firstly, the theories, hypotheses and approaches taken from the TEN DAYS background documents; secondly, the development and global education literature; thirdly, the data from the interviews. Unexpected outcomes need to be analyzed and support from the literature in respect of interpretations is useful. It should be born in mind that "this is a statment of the judgement of the researcher given the research problem, review of literature, methodology, and results. Often limitations are summarized, due to subject selection, the nature of the instrument used, or a weakness in the procedures." The conclusions are "summary statements of the findings and how the researcher interprets them . . . . supported by the data and logical analysis" It is important to "indicate limitations to the conclusions based on subject characteristics, the content of the research, when the research was conducted, the nature of the treatments, and the instruments used" (p. 12).

In this study, beyond considerations of generalizability, translatability and comparability of the findings, limitations include available resources; funding, time, people to do the necessary work. Due to the broad nature of global education, the study had to be restricted to the work of TEN DAYS and further restricted to the views and perspectives of six key educators and practitioners whose involvement with TEN DAYS has been both deep and broad for much of the thirty years of its existence. An attempt was made to include representatives from each of the PLURA churches however, due to the timing of the interviews, that was not possible.

Chapter Four: Goals, Objectives, and Conceptual Framework

In this chapter, the views of the participants interviewed in the study with regard to the goals, objectives and conceptual framework of global education of Ten Days for Global Justice will be presented and critically analyzed. As earlier described, the major goals and objectives of TEN DAYS are education and focused action to influence public opinion and to affect Canadian public policy in ways which recognize the linkages between international and domestic poverty. The data in this chapter clarify the meanings and interpretations of the participants about these goals and objectives. However, the intersection of the three data sources (documents relating specifically to TEN DAYS, the primary interview data, and the academic literature on development and global education) within the next two chapters provide an opportunity to enhance the critical reflection of the participants' contributions as compared to the documents and literature. The sifting process should enable the reader to see the essence or magnitude of the TEN DAYS agenda. Through their interviews the participants articulated their perspectives and concerns on specific issues or themes within the global education framework of TEN DAYS. These include their conception of development and the implications of considerations of race, class and gender in Canadian global education.

Core Goals of Ten Days for Global Justice

Twenty five years after the programme's establishment, the mission and vision of TEN DAYS was contained in the declaration that "Development Demands Justice," from The 1995 Agreement to Re-Mandate which summarizes and restates the overall goal of the programme:

> Through education and action, TEN DAYS challenges dehumanizing and destructive forces, and promotes alternative models of society that put people and creation first . . . . the primary purpose of TEN DAYS is to be an ecumenical Christian witness in the wider community on issues of global justice (p. 2).

The foundational goal of TEN DAYS is "ecclesial solidarity with the poor" and part of the ongoing strategy to concretize this goal has been to identify the Canadian public as the constituency toward which TEN DAYS directs its educational campaign in the formation of public policy (Larson, 1988, pp. 54, 57-61).

In this present study, interview participants indicated they were well-informed about the core goals and features of the TEN DAYS program as outlined in the literature. At the beginning of each interview participants were asked for their views as to what were the core goals and principal objectives of the TEN DAYS programme and in each case, the researcher was referred to the substantial background literature on the programme, specifically Larson

(1988), Stone (1985), the 1995 Agreement to Re-Mandate, and Reeve and Allan (2000). There appeared to be little debate about or disagreement with the fundamental programme goals and participants saw no need to discuss them as a separate interview topic. They were more concerned to communicate specific education and action plans designed to move toward the goals.

There was agreement that the faith-based organization and program is a strength. It provides TEN DAYS with an ability to involve a spiritual component when talking about social justice issues in an ecumenical organization, in contrast to teaching social justice issues in a school setting. In Mary's words, *"It provides support and hope for people who are involved in the challenges and the struggles"* (30 May 2000). As well, an integral part of the TEN DAYS resource materials is a separate faith resource which can be combined with the education and action resource, as appropriate, for schools, community organizations, and local groups. This approach provides a flexibility and integration which is not commonly an option for non-faith-based organizations.

Another aspect of spirituality in the TEN DAYS context is the, perhaps, unexpected development of what some have called a *"separate church,"* referring to the greater comfort some members of the sponsoring churches feel in TEN DAYS gatherings, rather than in mainline church settings. Mary's explanation was that, *"Many people feel on the fringes of the mainline churches but feel very comfortable . . . [with] the spiritual focus and the spiritual component of TEN DAYS . . . . that TEN DAYS is their spiritual home."* While it is likely that most people involved in TEN DAYS do derive some spiritual support from their participation, the circumstance *"that TEN DAYS is seen by some as a separate church has been a challenge"* (30 May 2000). Larson (1988) earlier commented on this phenomenon, observing similarly that TEN DAYS, as a

> sixth church . . . functions as something of an institutional safety net by providing an opportunity for Christians to address political questions and participate in public debate which would otherwise disrupt the internal theological and political status quo of the member churches. (p. 224)

This speaks to one of the primary concerns facing all social movements, the difficulty of critiquing the world system of which one is part and a primary beneficiary. More fundamentally, the reality is that the dominant ideology of neo-liberal globalism is hegemonic to the degree that antisystemic movements have, over the past 150 years, "essentially . . . turn[ed] themselves into fulfillers of the liberal dream while claiming to be its most fulsome critics" (Wallerstein, 1991, p. 180). Rediscovering, recovering Freire and

concientização in the context of his understanding of a critical pedagogy rooted in a social analysis which de-mystifies the deliberately vague, confusing, misleading and a-historical precepts of neo-liberal globalization is one of the immediate tasks of the global educator. For Freire (1968), *concientização* is the judicious process of "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements in reality" (p. 19). Freire's position is that while, clearly, "both humanization and dehumanization are possibilities" only humanization is "the ontological vocation" of humankind; dehumanization as historical reality is essentially a perversion of humanization and is only possible because of the distortions "of an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressors, which in turn dehumanizes the oppressed" (pp. 27-28). The point is that *concientização* is the instrument to combat oppression and TEN DAYS recognizes that any movement or initiative which seeks to transform the system of which it is part must continually seek the renewal of understanding and hope that the process of *concientização* engenders.

Today, concretely, and positively, hopefully, even as we saw in the period prior to and during the establishment of the TEN DAYS program, during the time of the Second Vatican Council and the beginnings of Liberation Theology in the late 1960s and early 1970s, solidarity and partnership with the poor in terms of

> Justice and ethical issues are being discussed jointly by Marxist, radical theologians and democrats who measure the progress of human beings not simply by possession of material goods, important as they are, but also in terms of increased ability to love, care for others and share a common life in which individuality, creativity and privacy are compatible with active participation in community. (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 127)

TEN DAYS, as part of the nonformal development education movement in Canada has changed its orientation, which began as

> a way of helping ameliorate the conditions of poverty in countries of the Third World . . . and has since evolved to include concern about parallel conditions in Canada and other industrialized countries. As perceptions of poverty have evolved from being regarded as the result of fate or forces of nature to being recognized as systemic problems, development education's emphasis has also shifted noticeably toward analysis of the cause of poverty, a concern for justice, and emphasis on structural transformation. (Reimer, Shute, & McCreary, 1993, p. 2)

An ongoing Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) preoccupation with the apparent contradiction that "the problems which development education seeks to address generally continue to grow more severe (Third World debt, for example)" was identified by Reimer et al. (1993) and attributed in part to "a confusion in agency perceptions of and expectations for their constituencies" (p. 2). Furthermore, assumptions about the learner

(how, what, and why they learn, as well desired outcomes) may not correspond to reality and there is

> a tremendous gap between development theory and current development education practice. It is a sobering paradox that despite rapidly maturing awareness of the complex realities of development (recognition of its human, social, spiritual, economic and ecological dimensions) over the past 30 years [now 40], many international development organizations continue to base their education programs largely on modernization theories. (p. 2)

In an attempt to understand why there is this "tremendous gap" between theory and practice in the face of abundant and unobjectionable evidence regarding the causes, and strategies for the eradication, of the crime of global poverty, and why the preference for a discredited model of development should persist, Reimer et al. (1993) have identified

> three major development education paradigms: development education about amelioration, development education about interdependence, and development education about social transformation. Two types of approaches, conservative and radical, exist within each paradigm. The six basic development education approaches (charity, self-help approach, structural critique, maldevelopment, empowerment approach, and *'conversion'*) can be distinguished on the basis of five characteristics: [implicit] thesis or program goals, [explicit] theme (content and thematic focus and level of analysis), educational tactics or methods, target audience, and terminology). (p. 3)

The evident preference for the amelioration paradigm of development education arises from its focus on informing Canadians about Third World conditions,

> based on the modernization theory of development which sees little wrong with the way the global community is currently structured, assumes that economic growth cures most ills, and proposes that the solution to poverty is to assist people to enter mainstream development with injections of capital and technology, preferably guided by educated entrepreneurial elite. (Reimer et al.,1993, p. 4)

This approach is characterized by "a shallow level of analysis of the causes of poverty . . . . tends to be emotive rather than factual, reactive rather than proactive [and] it is not likely that substantial, long-term social change (either in the First or Third World) will result from efforts stimulated by this paradigm" (Reimer et al., 1993, p. 4). If it is assumed that long term-social change is a desired outcome then support for this approach is indeed paradoxical, a seeming contradiction. If, however, the assumption is that, at most, the appearance of change is all that is required, then it becomes more apparent why this approach is favoured by those who benefit from the present social order.

By contrast, development education about interdependence draws on a dependency critique, the focus is on reform and redistribution, and education is intended "to raise the consciousness of Canadians about various actors in the development drama, to clarify the historical context of international development, and to provide the skills of analysis and

organization necessary for political action." Interdependence, linkages, recognizing some level of responsibility on the part of citizens in North countries for development (underdevelopment, maldevelopment), and a focus on social justice characterize this approach (Reimer et al., 1993, pp. 4-5).

A yet more holistic approach is development education for social and individual transformation where " development is a worldwide local and global phenomenon for which individual citizens must assume responsibility." A fundamental assumption is that "genuine change in the way a person perceives certain concepts" precedes lasting social change and "participation is the primary governing principle." Conflict is unavoidable, it is a sign that change is required, and is seen as an opportunity to engage in "fundamental structural transformation." The engagement of marginalized groups is a high priority, the "methods and techniques . . . are participatory, dialogical, process-oriented, and empowering," and the Freirean concept of conscientization is widely used, particularly the reflection-action cycle of praxis. Learners take "responsibility for their own learning, and are involved in all aspects of the educational process: needs assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation" (Reimer et al.,1993, pp. 5-6).

Clearly, from the point of view of maintaining the status quo, or engaging in cosmetic change only, these two approaches are unacceptable. Hence, we are left with the modernization paradigm and the "sobering paradox" of vast and growing global inequality in the face of incontrovertible evidence that ways and means are at hand to dramatically reduce, indeed eliminate, these scandalous injustices. So, in order for that to happen,

> It is necessary to utilize approaches within the transformative paradigm of development education (empowerment and conversion) in order to promote the structural change sought by development educators and to ensure widespread sustained interest in development-related issues. More specifically, development educators must seriously consider the implications of the conversion approach [which] argues that structural change is not possible without a change in deep-rooted, fundamental organizing concepts and values of individuals. (Reimer et al., 1993, p. 14)

Principal Objectives of the Programme

Interview participants indicated they were in agreement with the objectives of the TEN DAYS programme as outlined in the literature. They were asked for their understanding of the principal objectives of the TEN DAYS programme and in each case reference was made to the large body of background literature on the programme. As above, there seemed to be substantial agreement with the programme objectives and participants were more action-oriented than driven by theoretical considerations.

The 1995 Agreement to Re-Mandate reaffirmed and elaborated upon the original programme objectives of TEN DAYS, which were:

1. to make available, at least annually, development education resource materials for use in parishes, congregations and community groups.
2. to stimulate and support the creation of InterChurch and community groups which encourage awareness and action in development education at the local or regional level.
3. to evaluate national programmes of development education and suggested strategies and supports for programmes at local and national levels.
4. to act as a clearing house between denominations wishing to participate in development education programmes. (Larson, 1988, p. 120)

The continuity of programme objectives, of creating and supporting a nation-wide, and international, network for education, awareness and action, is evident. The notion of "a focused educational programme building to specific actions" (1981 Policy Statement, cited in Larson, 1988, p. 122) was carried forward by the 1995 Agreement to Re-Mandate and most recently appears in the KAIROS 2001-2002 Education for Action Guide. Over the thirty year period since the establishment of TEN DAYS there has been an increasingly clear, ongoing emphasis on the global nature of the concerns; global justice issues, national and and international linkages and networking, and recognition of the imperative for immediate concerted interfaith cooperation and collaboration at all levels.

The relevant topics are related to partnership, sharing of power, solidarity, human dignity, and an understanding that "the issue is first and foremost one of justice and injustice, defence of legitimate rights and control of power through participatory decision-making processes" where what is needed is "international economic and political justice" (Moffat, 1991, p. 15). In the context of TEN DAYS programmes,

resource people from the south [say] that the kind of consciousness-raising and the advocacy work that we are doing is absolutely critical to them. The resource people seem so very relieved that we do not get into fund-raising for projects, because many of them feel that has allowed us to escape from having to confront the real issues and our role in their continued dependency." (p. 16)

There are five foundational principles which have accompanied the growth of TEN DAYS as a social change network:

(1) a network for constructive social change must function out of principles of justice; (2) all people in the network have to be careful listeners, both in terms of to whom and to what they are listening; (3) the network needs to have a program with some common education, analysis, and action; (4) effective action and advocacy by the network concerning global justice issues requires an in-depth study of the issues from the perspective of the poor of the third world; and (5) in order to work toward change, we need to work with other sectors in Canada; we need to build coalitions. (Moffat, 1991, pp. 17-20)

Howlett (1991) agrees that building linkages is "the most important challenge facing development education in Canada . . . linkages between education and political action and linkages between development NGOs and other social movement groups" and that

> If development education is to be empowering, it must be action oriented . . . . starting with clear and specific goals in terms of the changes in public opinion and public policy that are being sought and then developing action and education strategies designed to achieve those changes. (p. 125)

> . . . Increasingly we see that all the most important issues are, in fact, global in nature and that they cannot be addressed effectively without a global perspective. Whether we are talking about the arms race and militarization, environmental degradation, or the debt crisis, the remedies dictated by those in power are cutbacks in health, education or social services. The structural causes are the same and affect Canadians as well as people in the third world even if in different ways and to different degrees. (p. 126)

Social movement groups have typically exhibited "sectoral fragmentation" and, consequently, limited "political power or influence," a "reformist, lobbying orientation," and an overall "lack of a broader social structural analysis" which prevents individuals, groups and organizations from "develop[ing] a critical understanding of their own situation or issue of particular concern . . . [*and*] making the connections to other sectors and issues" (Howlett, 1991, pp. 127-128). To the extent that contradictions displayed by individuals who hold "progressive or radical views on some issues and conservative or reactionary views on other issues" can be equated to Left (a "progressive or social politics") and Right ("conservative or sectarian politics"), the distinctions reach into the churches where "the right . . . feels the church should stay out of politics while the left argues that the struggle for justice is central to the Christian message" (p. 128). The central point relates to the "contradiction between experience and indoctrination" where, on the one hand, the lessons an individual has learned from personal experience are in conflict with the dominant hegemonic ideology. This causes stress and alienation as people are forced to doubt their own concrete realities and, in situations where they have no direct personal knowledge, are virtually forced to accept the views of the powerful in society which are constantly received and reinforced through mainstream media and formal education.

Here, the need for organizations such as TEN DAYS to engage in the "counter-hegemonic struggle" in concert with working class movements is clear. Moving "from a sectoral to a broader social structural analysis" is a vital part of the process and requires an understanding that "developing greater class or social consciousness is a key to the struggle for fundamental social transformation." This is one of the focal points

determining "whether the politics of social movement struggles are merely populist / reformist or radical / transformational" (Howlett, 1991, p. 129). The basis of the broad-based coalition(s) necessary to advancing the "counter-hegemonic struggle" was established in Canada during the early 1990s at the beginning of current free-trade era and "includes most of the key social movement sectors in Canada that share a commitment to social justice: labor, farm, cultural, native, women, anti-poverty, teachers, nurses, churches, environment, peace, cooperative, and seniors." There is, however, need for greater involvement on the part of "development NGOs, development education, and solidarity groups" (p. 130).

During the 1990s, largely under Howlett's influence, TEN DAYS moved in the direction of greater engagement with issues from a perspective which recognizes and "defines patriarchy or ecological destruction or war in the context of an analysis of the capitalist system" (Howlett, 1991, p. 128). This is in keeping with the growing recognition that the obstacles, or "limit situations," which prevent the attainment of liberation, that is, the realization of the "ontological and historical vocation of all human beings [which] is humanization, or becoming more fully human" (Roberts, 2000, p. 51) are conditioned by this global capitalist system to the extent that "it would be unrealistic to consider a desirable society anywhere in the world without starting from the all-pervading and dominant nature of the world-system's capitalist reality" (Addo, 1981, pp. 2, 3). Nevertheless, and more precisely, one limit situation for global educators is that "although the powerful critique [of late 20th-century developmentalism] developed by the dependency and world-systems literature . . . is widely known, it is commonly ignored" (Samoff, 1996, p. 127). Such critiques have become unacceptable (literally, unthinkable) in an intellectual climate where the ideological hegemony of neoliberal globalism "is so deeply embedded in a society's institutions and practices that it is scarcely noticed, rarely examined, and hardly ever challenged" (p. 145). Developmentalism is understood as a combination of a reinvigorated ideology of modernization and the imposition of conditionalities through structural adjustment programs which result in the enforced integration of national economies into the global economic system (p. 129). Similarly, Addo (1981), Freire (1998), Parkland (2000), and Ikeda (2002) have commented on this condition where no attempt is made to refute objective analyses of social inequalities and injustices; they are ignored insofar as possible or justified as necessary on the basis of racist, sexist and globalizing ideologies.

Definitions of Development

There are striking commonalities in participants' responses to my question on definitions of

development. The notion of "charity" is nowhere in evidence. Development is seen to involve questions of economic, social and political justice as well as personal dimensions of growth and development. Development is a participatory process through which people engage in working toward the attainment of their full potential as human beings. From Ruth's perspective it involves

> *shared decision making, shared planning, shared evaluation, and the naming of the problems rests with the people who are in the international program; there is giving and receiving on both sides. It is important that the Canadian partners have opportunity and a mindset to learn from their Southern partners. We need to do more listening and less telling.* (26 July 2000)

Ruth went on to say that for people to reach their full potential there is clearly a need for acceptable standards of access to *"food, housing, education, health care that sustains the individual, a family, and also leaves them enough financial and emotional resources for joy"* (26 July 2000).

For Mary development

> *promotes human and environmental well-being rather than the limited material gain of the few over the many; it promotes the common good in a collective society which values individual rights and involves a constant, ongoing critique and change of structures that should promote human and environmental development.* (30 May 2000)

In Sarah's view, *"It is the sharing of the earth's resources through sustainable development that benefits all peoples and respects creation"* (26 June 2000).

Paul said development demands improved living conditions, *"including education, health care, amenities such as good roads, better food supply, distribution of wealth, political freedom, absence of war (internal or external)"* (6 July 2000).

Rachel observed that development is *"the enhancement of the lives of those we share this planet with; quality of life, dignity, a sense of purpose and belonging, a sense of security, a feeling of safety, not feeling threatened"* (17 September 2000).

On the other hand, lack of development, as Paul put it,

> *is related to a differential access to power, both personal and structural, and is not confined to Third World/South situations. Colonialism, neo-colonialism, trade liberalization, globalization, various influences on trading patterns which are prejudicial to the interests of commodity producing regions of the world - which includes most of the South countries. World Bank and International Monetary Fund pressures through Structural Adjustment Programs; producing for export to pay foreign debt. Debt, tied aid, political instability plus massive expenditures on arms, poorly conceived 'development' projects, external control of development*

processes based on particular ideological orientations. (6 July 2000)

Ruth was emphatic in pointing to
> *the primary or exclusive focus on profits leading, among other things, to unemployment and starvation wages. Increasing isolation, within and between countries, of the (fantastically) rich from the (unbelievably) poor and those in the middle feeling alienated from both. Continued emphasis on competitive models of working rather than cooperative models. Suspicion, government and corporate graft and corruption.* (26 July 2000)

In Rachel's view, lack of development is largely a result of a *"lack of political will, and conflict between the objectives of globalization with those of development"* (17 September 2000).

Possible correctives to lack of development follow from the descriptions of development, to some extent. As well interview participants mentioned the following conditions as necessary:
> • power needed for shared problem identification and decision-making, local control of development projects, local and regional stability; • meeting material, emotional, physiological and psychological needs; • economic, political and social structures affecting human and environmental well-being, the common good serving both individual and collective needs; • sharing the earth's resources, sustainable development; • peace; • enhanced quality of life, dignity; • 'taming' globalization, recognizing that globalization is not development; • Fair Trade practices; • elimination of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) and other conditionalities; • debt reduction or cancellation of 'odious' debts and transfer of those financial resources to housing, health, education; • better understanding of the issues, both within directly affected countries and especially by those in the 'donor' nations; • education / awareness / action initiatives like TEN DAYS to mobilize Canadians in support and solidarity with people in South countries; • recognition of the importance of initiatives like the Third World Visitors Program to provide face-to-face opportunities for encounters with people from other parts of the world, and opportunities to see the situation of others through their eyes.

These comments confirm earlier observations that there is greater "emphasis on the potential of local people and local resources . . . . on participatory community level development education work . . . . partnership and interdependence . . . . the diagnosis of reasons for the problems of poverty has slowly moved from blaming victims of poverty to seeing how Western lifestyles implicate ordinary citizens of industrialized countries in the perpetuation of Third World and domestic poverty." Attention has moved from an exclusive focus on "symptoms to an analysis of root causes of poverty, an emphasis observable in the shifting of overseas programming (from immediate relief to long-term development to advocacy with the intention of changing unjust international structures) as well as in education materials and programs" (Reimer et al., 1993, pp. 12-13).

Ruth reiterated the need for limits on profits, recovering the concept of usury, promoting cooperative models of development, and reintroducing the idea that ethics and morality are more important than the profit motive (26 July 2000). The biblical injunctions against usury, or charging of interest on loans, are unequivocal (Lev. 25:36; Neh. 5:10; Ps. 15:5). Church fathers, in the early stages of capitalist development, felt constrained to relax these prohibitions, first changing the meaning of usury to the charging of "excessive" or "exorbitant "interest then doing away with the term altogether (Weber, 1904-1905/1958). Although, from the perspective of the church bankers and commercial elites, this was a brilliant move to promote the capitalist goal of endless and limitless accumulation, it substantially diminished the moral authority of the church. This is an obstacle faced by justice-oriented persons who seek to work from a faith-based stance. Prior to the late Middle Ages the Church had "constrained capitalist thrusts, in the form of preaching against avarice. . . . [increasingly however,] the Church was a major economic actor itself. . . . [forced] to defend its own organizational life, the Church became at this time even more involved in economic and financial matters" (Wallerstein, 1992: 606-609).

Growing recognition of the devastating effects of the enormous, increasingly unbridled control and influence wielded by the IFIs in world affairs accentuates the need for meaningful regulatory control. From the perspective of the neoliberal development paradigm, the purpose of development is growth and it is measured largely by a series of indicators related to the accrual of benefits to national and international ruling class groups, especially "rates of capital accumulation, foreign trade and elite financial flows." It is more accurate to say that, in this paradigm, "'development' is a growth of injustice" (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 122). Clearly, as a measure or indicator of development, GNP is not enough. Quality of life indicators which include life expectancy, child mortality rates, caloric intake, educational and literary levels are more relevant measures of development. Here as well, "In devising indicators of development . . . the socio-political and economic structures and processes that produce those outcomes" must also be considered. "The issue is the sustainability of quality of life indicators, which is rooted in the class nature and democratic accountability of the political regime." Quality of life indicators show great variability "according to class, gender and race" (p. 124).

Styles of development--from below, from above, from within, from without--show similarities with the contrasting paradigms of globalization-from-below and from-above. Globalization-from-above is characterized by "off-shore" production; a single world

market; the globalization of international capital markets; the central development and control of new technologies; global institutions (World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, other G7/8 associations at regional levels); corporate restructuring ("strategic alliances, global outsourcing, captive suppliers, supplier chains . . . transnational mergers"); the changing structure of work ("'re-commodification of labor' in which workers have increasingly lost all rights except the right to sell their labor power"); neoliberal ideology and policies (the "'Washington consensus'[which] argues that markets are efficient and that government intervention in them is almost always bad . . . . policy implications--privatization, deregulation, open markets, balanced budgets, deflationary austerity, and dismantling of the welfare state"); the changing role of the nation state (with less power, especially their capacity "to serve the interests of their own people . . . . pursue full employment policies or regulate corporations. . . . [and implement] environmental and social protections. Neoliberal ideology reshaped beliefs about what government should do or what it is able to accomplish."); neo-imperialism ("Globalization has restored much of the global dominance of the former imperialist powers [and] has taken from poor countries control of their own economic policies and concentrated their assets in the hands of first world investors." Some third world elites have benefited immensely, but "it has subordinated them to foreign corporations, international institutions, and dominant states. It has intensified economic rivalry among the rich powers."); movement of people (contradictory pressures of forced, accelerated migration and increasingly repressive restrictions on human movement plus increased international travel and tourism); and cultural homogenisation ("Growing domination of global media by a few countries and companies . . . uniform culture of corporate globalism [and] free-market capitalism") (Brecher, Costello, & Smith, 2000, pp. 2-4).

Globalization-from-above is rife with contradictions. It
> promotes a destructive competition in which workers, communities, and entire countries are forced to cut labor, social, and environmental costs to attract mobile capital . . . . a disastrous 'race to the bottom' [which] bring with it the dubious blessing of impoverishment, growing inequality, economic volatility, the degradation of democracy, and destruction of the environment. (Brecher et al., 2000, pp. 5-6)

On the other hand, globalization-from-below is seen as a response to "corporate, top-down globalization" and is characterized by "a solidarity that crosses the boundaries of nations, identities, and narrow interests" (Brecher et al., 2000, p. x). Resistance to globalization, or the growing power of international capital, has been building since at least the late 1800s. The activities of TEN DAYS and other antisystemic movements are part of an historical trend. It is quite predictable that there should be spontaneous demands for change to an

unjust social order in response to "the manifestation of the weaknesses and perils inherent in a self-regulating market system" (Polanyi, 1944, p. 147) and that (in an earlier historical period) "the change from liberal to 'collectivist' solutions happened sometimes over night and without any consciousness on the part of those engaged in the process of legislative rumination" (p. 148). Moreover, these changes occurred "in various countries of a widely dissimilar political and ideological configuration . . . . [where] each of them passed through a period of free trade and *laissez-faire*, followed by a period of anti-liberal legislation in regard to public health, factory conditions, municipal trading, social insurance, shipping subsidies, public utilities, trade associations, and so on." This provides historical evidence that "under the most varied slogans, with very different motivations a multitude of parties and social strata put into effect almost exactly the same measures in a series of countries in respect of a large number of complicated subjects" (pp. 149-150).

The point is that one part of the double movement (systemic and anti-systemic) is an expression of the impulse to self-protection "on the part of a great variety of people" in face of the threat posed by the "market economy . . . to the human and natural components of the social fabric." This entirely predictable response occurred "without any theoretical or intellectual preconceptions on their part, and irrespective of their attitudes towards the principles underlying a market economy." Likewise, behaviour of various governments did not conform to acceptable standards of ideological purity, nor did ardent economic liberals shrink from intervening in the operation "free" market to ensure the integrity of the "self-regulating" market. In the end,

> nothing could be more decisive than the evidence of history as to which of the two contending interpretations of the double movement was correct: that of the economic liberal who maintained that his policy never had a chance, but was strangled by shortsighted trade unionists, Marxist intellectuals, greedy manufacturers, and reactionary landlords; or that of his critics, who can point to the universal 'collectivist' reaction against the expansion of market economy in the second half of the nineteenth century as conclusive proof of the peril to society inherent in the utopian principle of a self-regulating market. (Polanyi, 1944, p. 152)

In the present, these early years of the 21st century clearly are situated in an historical moment when the present world-system is susceptible to a transformation, indeed, it is undergoing a "sea-change of major proportions" (Arrighi & Silver, 1999, p. 1). Doubtless, the change will be to another mode of greater or lesser domination, "the fundamental theme of our epoch" (Freire, 1968, p. 93), but we need to ask how might we work to direct this change to advance the project of humanization? As Brecher et al. (2000) argue,

> Globalization is both inevitable and, in its present form, unsustainable. What will come after it is far from determined. It could be a war of all against all, world

domination by a single super-power, a tyrannical alliance of global elites, global
ecological catastrophe, or some combination thereof. Human agency . . . can play a
role in deciding between those futures and more hopeful ones. (p. xiv)

In this conceptualization of globalization-from-below, it is a response to "corporate, top-
down globalization" and is characterized by "a solidarity that crosses the boundaries of
nations, identities, and narrow interests." However,

this movement can only succeed if it evolves from resistance, reform, and restoration
to transformation--albeit a transformation that is rooted in today's resistance, that
reforms institutions at every level, and that restores those elements of democracy,
diversity, and ecological balance that globalization from above has destroyed. Such
a transformation requires a multilevel strategy and program to impose new rules on
the global economy while transferring wealth and power to ordinary people--a
worldwide economic and political democratization. (Brecher et al., 2000, pp. x-xi)

This is in keeping with the views advanced by interview participants which emphasize a
participatory process of development and are partially affirmed in a recent Canadian Council
for International Cooperation (CCIC) Commentary on the Canadian International
Development Agency's (CIDA) Long Term Strategy for International Development
Assistance (2001), where development is understood as "an iterative domestic political
process." That section of the Commentary states that,

strengthening the participation, voice and rights of those living in poverty is one of
the most important dimensions of new approaches to aid . . . . people-centred
development for poverty eradication is ultimately about recognizing the rights of the
vulnerable, and transforming the power relations, and cultural and social interests
that sustain inequality. Consequently, finding avenues to address unequal power,
capacity, and access to resources for those without rights - the poor and the
marginalized - is a fundamental challenge to donor interventions wanting to link
poverty reduction to democratic governance and participation. *Development is not a
process easily amenable to bureaucratic and technical fixes; rather it is widely
recognized as an iterative domestic political process, even in the most aid-
dependent countries. It is a political process that engages people, particularly the
poor and the powerless, in negotiating with each other, with their governments,
and with the world community for policies and rights that advance their livelihood
and secure their future in their world.* (p. 10)

Other observers also find CIDA language to be confusing; much of it deliberately so. It is
held that the governments of the rich and powerful states, the G7/8 in short or the Euro-
American imperium, have been remarkably (but far from completely) successful in a
strategy of global economic domination through the instruments of the international
financial institutions (IFIs), always with the threat of (and unfortunately, increasing actual
resort to) military violence against those who will not otherwise be persuaded of the
"inevitability" of globalization. In the world as it is, it is quite unrealistic to suggest that
people who are increasingly marginalized by the process of globalization are able

consistently to bargain from equal positions of strength "with each other, with their governments, and with the world community for policies and rights that advance their livelihood and secure their future in their world." At the same time, while it is true that the powerful will not easily transform there are many hopeful and constructive examples of people-centred development where elites and states and even TNCs have had to negotiate with marginalized groups.

An example of the gains made by popular, progressive movements and organizations, where people-centred development has been negotiated with states, elites and even TNCs, where the voices of the marginalized have been meaningfully heard, recognized and responded to, is found in the campaign resisting the long-term agenda of globalization-from-above embodied in such initiatives as the earlier OECD-sponsored Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI). The Council of Canadians, "an independent, nonpartisan, public interest organization, established in 1985 provide a critical voice on key national issues: safeguarding our social programs, promoting economic justice, renewing our democracy, asserting Canadian sovereignty, promoting alternatives to corporate-style free trade, and preserving our environment" (http://www.canadians.org), called the MAI "a bill of rights for money" designed to level the playing field for investors by freeing up the flow of their profit and capital, including manufacturing facilities, among participating nations; "a charter of rights and freedoms for the world's corporations." It was intended to give corporations rights to sue governments, but with no accountability on their part for the public welfare and the planet.

There was as much concern about the secretive way in which the MAI was negotiated, with no public discussion or debate, as about the treaty itself. Clark, Barlow, Grieshaber-Otto, & Finn (1997) maintained that although it was "an instrument for making global corporate rule absolute . . . . most politicians, let alone citizens in general, [had] never even heard of it." Since then, the rapid growth of this education and action campaign into the current level of public awareness of the general direction of G7/8, WTO, IMF, WB-led development strategies shows that the antisystemic side of the "double movement" has great transformational potential. TEN DAYS has played an important role in providing its constituency with a more critical analysis of the debate, one which proceeds from a particular understanding of development.

Cooperation, international cooperation for development and global justice is "between popular movements in the North . . . [and] in the South" where "the style of development:

'development from below' versus 'development from above', and its corollary, 'development from within' versus 'development from without'" is dependent upon the degree to which it recognizes that "Fundamental justice . . . based on the principle that social cooperation in production (embedded in the current social division of labour) should be expressed in social ownership of the means of production." Cooperation "takes on a new and revolutionary meaning when linked with movements for development from below, because it means providing aid to struggles not just against poverty but also against the institutional structures and relations that produce poverty" (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, pp. 123-125).

Cooperation is important in that "efforts by imperial powers to reimpose models of 'development from above and the outside' can be resisted through national popular movements and international cooperation from below." The interconnectedness between " international cooperation . . . [and] political-economic transformative movements" is recognized and strengthened as consultative processes which prioritize producer concerns on a reciprocal and equal basis and "contribute to building a national movement intent on transforming the social system." In order to de-mystify the reports and recommendations produced by the IFIs, and state agencies like CIDA, to establish "an ambience of cooperation and a common understanding of development and justice" it is necessary to formulate "an ideology that identifies the principal causes of conflict, underdevelopment and injustice" (Petras & Veltmeyer, 2001, pp. 125-126).

An emerging view is that the concept of sustainable development has to be recast in terms of "developing sustainability" where "development is the means by which community stability and sustainability is achieved . . . . [through] a process of local ownership and community participation. Such a process allows people as a collective to articulate personal and community values and objectives, devise cooperatively a process of development to achieve these objectives and participate in building a sustainable foundation for the community" (Arnold & Harvey, 1991, p. 88). Recent campaigns in which TEN DAYS has participated, and which have as their fundamental goal the sustainability of development of communities and regions throughout the world, have increasingly focused on Debt, especially through the ongoing Jubilee campaign.

The immediate relationship between the issues and concerns of global development education and different aspects of international Debt are painfully evident. In an education / action workshop called "turning the tables" TEN DAYS looks at the question of who owes

the debt to whom? From this perspective, faces of the global debt include: (1) debts owed to the global South; (2) to Aboriginal Peoples; (3) to the Earth; and (4) to Future Generations (KAIROS, 2002).

Beyond these reasonably well-publicized campaigns in opposition to the "unpayable and odious debt identified by the Jubilee campaign," there is a largely unreported (in North countries),

> widespread and sustained resistance to IMF and World Bank policies by millions in the world's poorest countries . . . [where] protests against these institutions and their policies were not limited to privileged 'students and anarchists' from rich countries, as some politicians and the IMF and World Bank themselves had tried to claim, but led by the world's poorest people . . . . The protesters include: peasant farmers, indigenous peoples, the unemployed, teachers, civil servants, priests, doctors, public-sector workers, trade-union activists and owners of small business. Typically the protests are against cuts in government expenditure, privatisation of state-run industries, and the removal of price controls and subsidies.

> . . . The IMF claims to put poverty reduction at the centre of its policies but we have to ask how deep its commitment goes when the world's poor--those closest to the policies on the ground--are its fiercest critics. (World Development Movement, 20 April 2002)

The further participation of TEN DAYS, through CCIC, in education and action campaigns related to the growing concerns about undemocratic, unrepresentative and secretive decision-making strategies undertaken by the G7/8, World Bank, IMF, WTO complex of IFIs is part of the overall strategy of coalition-building in Canada and globally to address these major issues which are fundamentally issues of human development.

"Race," Class, Gender in Global Education

The role, influence and importance of race, social class, and gender is evident in the composition of TEN DAYS participants. Sarah noted that

> *class influences active, ongoing participation in TEN DAYS committees; involvement takes time and money. Not everyone is free to be part of a committee situation. Young families, mothers or fathers, have other pressures put on them* (26 June 2000).

Paul also concurred that

> *the composition, the demographics, of TEN DAYS participants are quite distinct and will probably remain that way. Active, sustained involvement with the program requires a certain amount of discretionary time and money. A single working mother, for example, is unlikely to be able to spend a lot of time with TEN DAYS, normally. So, it continues to be largely a white female, middle class phenomenon. Maybe men, generally, aren't interested in this sort of thing. [And while] the committees generally recognize the need to attract people from other racial or ethnic backgrounds, for many, though, the program is seen as a white Canadian type of thing.* (6 July 2000)

Interview participants agreed that distinctions based on class or socio-economic status and race or ethnicity are generally recognized as part of Canadian social reality, but in varying degrees. On the one hand, phenomena such as the growing disparity between the wealth and incomes of the top ten percent and the bottom ten percent of Canadians are seen as cause for alarm. However, as Sarah put it, while

> *race has an implication when we talk about development, trying to relate it to our local experience, bringing in the aboriginal people and the immigrant refugee population, looking at jobs or security, it brings into realization that in Canada racism does exist, class analysis is not so apparent. We are aware of the social implications of consumerism, materialism and so on. We don't address it but we're aware that it's part of how we relate to people in our own local congregations. We have to be aware that when you're talking about minimum wage, for example, others might resist that, or it would make them uncomfortable. It's a consideration as to how you address a situation, including the language you use.* (26 June 2000)

Some participants were of the opinion that there is considerable reluctance to accept the fact of racism in Canada, defined for the purposes of this study as

> the belief that one racial or ethnic group is inferior to another and that unequal treatment is therefore justified. Racism may be expressed individually or institutionally (Edmonton Social Planning Council, 1994, in *Alberta Facts,* No. 15).

Canadians, generally, react strongly to charges of racism. Among other common responses, the "discourse of denial" holds that

> because Canada is a society that upholds the ideals of a liberal democracy, it could not possibly be racist. When racism is shown to exist, it tends to be identified as an isolated phenomenon relating to a limited number of social deviants, economic instability, or the consequence of 'undemocratic' traditions that are disappearing from the Canadian scene . . . . While individuals, organizations, institutions, and the state vigorously deny the presence of racism, it flourishes in this liberal democratic country, deeply affecting the daily lives of [many Canadians]. (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000, pp. 26, 7)

As Ruth observed,

> *Canadians don't see that and don't want to. It's easier to focus on class analysis. People are getting used to thinking of the poor and the rich and the middle class in between and recognizing that the middle class is diminishing in size and economic and political power. But it's the racial analysis that they really object to. When we look at the Third World and at the poor in North America, it is obvious that people of colour get the short end of the stick I think much of poverty must be rooted firmly in racism as well as in issues of greed and power.* (26 July 2000)

With regard to the implications of class and racial analysis for development education in Canada, Ruth said,

> *it makes it difficult. It's absolutely crucial to make the local links with the global situation and it's easier to do that with class analysis than it is to do it with racial*

analysis in Canada. So we run into difficulties explaining issues - for example, in the Jubilee initiative, we have not yet dealt with Canadian Native issues. It would have fit in very comfortably, very well (very uncomfortably), with redistribution of wealth. We didn't do that because it would have been too controversial, we couldn't sell the program. It's easier to fit Native issues in with re-creation of the environment, than it is to deal with land settlement and self-government and the fact that the majority of people incarcerated in our jails are Native or of Native ancestry. The bulk of the poor in Canada are women and Native people. Our unwillingness to look at racial issues had a significant impact on the choice to leave the Native issues for the third year rather than tackle them in the second year where it dealt with money. The lawsuits and the fact that Natives don't pay taxes, land rights and treaty settlements, and so on are hot issues that at this point are maybe too complex to take on in one year and deal with effectively. So rather than get peoples' backs up we went with the clothing and sweatshop labor. (On this point, people were astounded to find out this, sweatshops, happens in Canada. They actually thought it could not and would not happen here.)

So the implications for development education in Canada are if you're going to use a racial analysis you need to be very careful how you do it. It needs to be very carefully presented with clear, concrete examples. You need an issue, a hook that people can identify with, that they can see it is a problem, it is an issue in Canada, and there is something we can do to make a change. Otherwise, you simply polarize people and turn them off and away. So, we haven't come too far in answering that question. (26 July 2000)

TEN DAYS learning resources which would focus on racial or ethnic differences as central to an analysis of national and international societal concerns have been routinely suppressed on the grounds that they would be unacceptable to various constituencies of the program. It has been said that "the currents of racism in Canadian society run deep, they run smooth, lulling white Canadians into a complacency that will see racism anywhere else but in Canada" (Philip, 1994). Similarly, "it always amazes me when people express surprise that there might be a *race problem* in Canada, or when they attribute the *problem* to a minority of prejudiced individuals. Racism is, and always has been, one of the bedrock institutions of Canadian society, embedded in the very fabric of our thinking, our personality" (Shadd, 1989).

The important point to note is that racism serves a purpose, it "is a sociocultural system that achieves specific objectives" in the defence of privilege (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000, pp. 53-54). The widespread understanding that that the "concepts of race and racial classification can be rejected as unnecessary and unscientific because they add nothing to the understanding of the human species" does not change the reality that "racism is one of the most important causes of human inequality" (p. 36). There is "a focus on power relations, in which social, economic, and political inequalities become the centre of attention." Individual skin colour prejudice and racism have only recently in human

history been formalized as "structural principles defining systems of slavery, caste, or class," which systems themselves have long existed. "The impetus for the development of institutional or systemic racism came from the mercantilist expansion of European countries into Asia, Africa, and the Americas" (p. 38).

In Canada, racism is found at various levels. At the individual level, as a "symptom of the more serious malaise in the relationships between racial groups." It is held that "social and psychological considerations should be examined within the sociocultural context that produces and reproduces inequality and injustice." At the institutional level, racism is integrated into policies, practices and procedures, whereas systemic racism "refers to the laws, rules, and norms woven into the social system that result in an unequal distribution of economic, political, and social resources and rewards" including but not limited to "denial of access, participation, and equity to racial minorities for services such as education, employment, and housing." Cultural and ideological racism is "formulated as a set of values and ideas . . . . deeply embedded in the society's value system" supported by a "tacit network of beliefs and values that encourage and justify discriminatory practices" (Henry et al., 2000, pp. 54-57). These are all facets of "Democratic Racism" or ideological racism where, on the one hand, it is felt that there is a "paradox in that both a liberal and democratic value system *and* racist beliefs and behaviours--beliefs systems that should be in conflict with each other--nevertheless coexist." On the other hand, the paradox disappears if racism actually "functions in society to maintain the power and privilege of certain groups at the expense of others" (p. 57). The problem is the perception of a paradox and the consequent need for a concept of democratic racism which functions to justify the "inherent conflict between the egalitarian values of justice and fairness and the racist ideologies reflected in the collective mass belief system as well as the racist attitudes, perceptions and assumptions of individuals" (p. 19).

The ongoing debate "with respect to the primacy of class versus the autonomy of race in the analysis of racism" is important, especially as it relates to the role of the state and the "politics of racism" and because "Canadian scholars have written relatively little on racism . . . . The dominant concern . . . until very recently, has been ethnicity and multicultural studies." The argument is made that racism is useful in capitalist exploitation of labour; that it "acts to mystify social reality, justifies the exploitation of certain groups of peoples' labour power, and contributes to the maintenance of the status quo" (Satzewich, 1989, in Henry et al., 2000, p. 39). Racism and sexism are "inherent and necessary . . . . a fundamental feature of the geoculture of the capitalist world-economy." To the extent that

the "world-economy is capitalist . . . based on the operation of a 'law of value', which involves the distribution of rewards to those who give priority to the endless accumulation of capital," racism and sexism function as "systemic cultural pressures designed to . . . discipline and channel the work force" (Wallerstein, 1991, pp. 12, 107). "Racism and sexism, when institutionalized, create a high correlation between low group status and low income." The rationale is that racially-excluded groups and women "are paid less because they work less hard . . . . and because there is something, if not in their biology, at least in their 'culture' which teaches them values that conflict with the universal work ethos" (p. 175). In Canada, Democratic Racism "holds that the spread of racism should only be dealt with--if at all--by leaving basic economic structures and societal relations essentially unchanged (Gilroy, 1987)" (Henry et al., 2000, p. 23). The "ideological discursive" form depends on a set of "values, assumptions, and arguments" embedded in and based upon "myths and misconceptions about racism [which have] permitted a pattern of denial that has led to a wholly inadequate response to racism." Democratic racism must mediate the contradiction "between the ideology of democratic liberalism and the racist ideology present in the collective belief system of the dominant culture." It is supported by the mass culture and discourse emerging from

> society's frames of reference . . . . [the] largely unacknowledged set of beliefs, assumptions, feelings, stories, and quasi-memories that underlie, sustain, and inform perceptions, thoughts, and actions. Democratic racism as racist discourse begins in the families that nurture us, the communities that socialize us, the schools and universities that educate us, the media that communicate ideas and images to us, and the popular culture that entertains us. (p. 24)

Racism as ideology is an important part of what Freire (1998) identifies as the "capacity to tame, inherent in ideology." He uses the example of "the cynical fatalism of neoliberal thought, which proclaims that mass unemployment is an inevitable end-of-the-century calamity," and which

> makes us at times docilely accept that the globalization of the economy is its own invention, a kind of inevitable destiny, an almost metaphysical entity rather than a moment of economic development, subject to a given political orientation dictated by the interests of those who hold power, as is the whole of capitalist economic production. (p. 113)

> Globalization theory, which speaks of ethics, hides the fact that its ethics are those of the marketplace and not the universal ethics of the human person . . . . [hides] that fearful evil that is historical capitalism . . . . [hides] the increasing wealth of the few and the rapid increase of poverty and misery for the vast majority of humanity. The capitalist system reaches, in its globalizing neoliberal crusade, the maximum efficacy of its intrinsically evil nature. (p. 114)

Ethics are at the heart of Freire's critique of neoliberal globalism. He decries the "transgression of a universal human ethic in the name of the market," where the "perverse

ethic of profit" constitutes the urgent "threat . . . to our own identity as human persons caught up in the ferocity of the ethics of the marketplace," and concludes

> I know full well how difficult it is to put in practice a policy of development that would put men and women before profit. However, I believe that if we are going to overcome the crises that at present assail us, we must return to ethics [the ethics of universal human aspiration. . . . of human solidarity]. I do not see any other alternative. (Freire, 1998, pp. 115, 116, 117)

At the same time, "the principle of hope that underlies his life's work" is accompanied by a "powerfully prescriptive" discourse linking educational theory and practice, where

> the accomplishment of critical consciousness consists in the first place in the learner's capacity to situate herself in her own historicity, for example, to grasp the class, race, and sexual aspects of education and social formation and to understand the complexity of the relations that have produced this situation . . . . [through] a critical examination of received wisdom. (Aronowitz, 1998, pp. 12, 14)

Hope, in this sense, is needed by social movements in order to continue; hope "not in an idealistic sense that the world will somehow get better, but in a dialectical sense of concurrently appreciating the grim realities, working as hard as possible to transform unpeaceful structures, and passing on the spirit of hope to more fellow human beings" (Floresca-Cawagas & Toh, 1989).

This is the position facing TEN DAYS, in which an ongoing critical examination of received wisdom is central to the praxis of the organization. As part of the local, regional, global socio-economic system and unavoidably imbued with the dominant hegemonic ideology of globalism, TEN DAYS participants and organizers struggle with the reality of inequities and injustices based on race, class and gender. To the extent that these inequities are reproduced within the organizational structure there are serious implications for TEN DAY's impact as a development education organization. Its "avoidance" of race / ethnicity and gender is limiting potential participants. The class-orientation is recognized as a limitation but also a reality reflecting the composition of the larger church of which TEN DAYS is a small part. The marginalized position of women in the overall picture of global development issues, which is being further eroded by the forces of globalization where "the dominance of market processes undervalues anything that is not directly calculable in terms of money" (Ghosh, 1996, p. 119) is central to the TEN DAYS analysis of global justice. That far more Canadian women than men are active in grassroots organizations like TEN DAYS is part of the "gender" issue in global / development education. Given the church's position on women and gender issues this is a significant gap in the TEN DAYS framework.

Action, Education and Analysis

Initially, for TEN DAYS organizers, the question was whether the goal of development education is to inform Canadians about world affairs and global realities or to use this heightened awareness as a springboard or first step in concentrated and concerted action focused on global social transformation (Larson, 1988, p. 147). In the end, education and action for change were seen as inseparable parts of a unified approach to global justice concerns. That is, the purpose of this approach to education is not education itself but rather it is to understand social reality (s) and to work to improve conditions.

Conversations, discussions and interviews with program participants in the course of this study confirm the view that education, action, analysis and reflection are all fundamental parts of the process or cycle. Mary stated that *"action to build a better world"* is the goal of this *"Canadian inter-church coalition and network of community-based, ecumenical groups that works in solidarity with all people who are struggling to shape a world built on peace, justice and the integrity of creation"* (30 May 2000).

If this educational method is cyclical in nature, with education leading to action followed by reflection which leads to further action/reflection, where does one begin? For Sarah
> *personal experience is the starting point. Take the example of buying a pound of coffee: in this pound of coffee, who is benefiting by my purchase of it? If I am keeping my sister/brother at a poverty level, being dominated by others, and not getting a fair share for the amount of work being put into that product, then from my experience I have to think that's not what my faith tells me and then you get into the rationale, the research and the education resources that come to us and help us make the connections. Then we can determine what actions we want to participate in that might benefit that person we need to help or lift up, the farmer that's growing the coffee. But it all has to come back to our own experience. If we don't experience it then it's difficult to be a part of any action. The education/action process is a circle and you can't stop the action or the experience or the reflection. From the action you may or may not get a result but you come back to your experience of the action and you start again. It's all important. The experience a person has determines where they enter in that circle.* (26 June 2000)

Mary also referred to the *"action-reflection model"* and the need for *"focused education and action,"* while concurring with the view that
> *whoever is involved has an experience and an understanding which they bring with them and are challenged by listening to other people, listening to Southern partners, listening to experiences that they themselves haven't had. That is participatory education and there needs to be an action component. This has been an obstacle for TEN DAYS. There needs to be empowerment to move beyond hearing about the injustice, or even experiencing an injustice, to taking the next step of doing something.* (30 May 2000)

Paul was of the opinion that

> education is easiest to do; its like putting on a program in a church. The viewers
> and the hearers are not really partaking of some action. But if you do put on some
> action, like the Just Christmas sales and the Fair Trade sales, and fashion shows,
> it affects people more. You tend to put more effort into it and more risk as well.
> And so you get more out of it. (6 July 2000)

He also emphasized the importance of overseas involvement, or exposure to those with that experience, to *"see what it's like in other parts of the world. It seems that anyone who has been overseas is more interested in working on problems than people who just read about it"* (6 July 2000).

And, finally, on the relative importance of *"education, action, and advocacy,"* for Ruth, it has to be

> all three. People enter the circle of praxis through education and action, but there
> is also the theological entry point. It is important to provide programming that
> intersects the circle of praxis at all three levels; to meet the needs of participants at
> each entry point, at the level they happen to be at in their own process of
> development. (26 July 2000)

A distinctive element in Freire's approach to critical pedagogy and conscientization is that although the "ontological vocation of humanization" must recognize "the educational significance of differences across class, race, and gender lines . . . there is something about being human which transcends these differences" (Roberts, 2000, p. 49). An important by-product of action for societal improvement is the positive effect participants agree it has on personal growth. Clearly, where the cycle or circle begins is determined by one's personal experiences. Where it goes is shaped by the need to move beyond learning about problems and to become involved in one or another of the variety of action-for-change groups and organizations. In principle, education and action, or education for action, is the objective of the program; in fact, there is need for more action.

We have seen that the foundational goal of TEN DAYS is solidarity with the poor, the oppressed, and is expressed concretely in program objectives which are clarified and refined through an approach to, and understanding of, development education where education / awareness is a vital part, but only one part, of the cycle of praxis. This process is mitigated by ways in which decisions are made and by considerations of race, class and gender. Essentially, this is a process whereby concrete expressions of solidarity are thought to be leading incrementally to the realization of global social justice objectives. Whether this is substantially the case is open to debate but clearly TEN DAYS, in concert with other interChurch coalitions, and as part of wider coalitions including Canadian and global civil society organizations (CSOs), has moved strongly in the direction of addressing the

concerns arising from the problem of global debt enslavement. Social analysis, as evident in the evolution of views on development discussed above, leads progressively to the root causes of inequities and injustices embedded in the global system of maldevelopment characterized by the control exercised by the IFIs (international financial institutions) over the affairs of the majority of the world's people. This control has reached the point where many nation states function, to a large extent, as prison camps where the poor of the world work as economic slaves to repay the odious debts incurred in their name and on their behalf by a despotic ruling class, both indigenous and with the assistance of the IFIs. At the same time that the IFIs are becoming increasingly dominant and claiming victory, others insist that "antisystemic movements are far from being dead, and the united action of the oppressed people will continue until the system of oppression is dismantled" (Ikeda, 2002: 13).

At this moment of historical transition, TEN DAYS and other coalitions will agree substantially with the view that resistance to oppression is growing. The IFIs have been identified as the command and control centres of the global economic system, dominated by G7/8 countries and a decreasing number of increasingly influential TNCs. The power of states is being redirected to serve the interests of this small segment of the world's population, to the detriment of the vast majority. The IFIs, and those segments of the G7/8 countries which dominate the system of international finance, are identifiable and campaigns of education and action are designed to persuade the WB / WTO complex to put human beings and other life forms into the balance sheets.

Recently, CCIC, ACGC and Parkland produced an informative, action-oriented public education campaign around these issues prior to the 2002 G7/8 meeting in Alberta. A central part of the education-action strategy focused on the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and is illustrative of the dimension of the development debate at the beginning of the new millennium. From one perspective, the plan is globalization-from-above, business-as-usual. The partnership agreement was produced by the IFIs under the imprimatur of a few high-profile African leaders with no pretence of public involvement, and it is designed to reward certain people in countries which collaborate with the globalizers. Clearly, NEPAD is precisely this. However, another perspective is that the level of debate, and growing awareness of the profound dangers of globalization-from-above is new and very hopeful. It is seen as a victory, an important and hopeful advance in the global education campaign.

Chapter Five: Strategies, Effectiveness, and Solidarity

The purpose of chapter five is to examine study data which relate to on-going program activities, and which have an important impact on its effectiveness, support, continuity and direction or major emphases and foci. There are good reasons why TEN DAYS tends to focus less on food banks, for example, and more on initiatives and activities such as the Jubilee Campaign which identify the network of international financial institutions (IFIs) as principal reasons food banks and other coping mechanisms are necessary throughout the world. This chapter looks at some of the means by which program participants are able to keep informed, committed and active while avoiding overload and burnout. There are three major categories related to the research questions and nine themes within these categories. The categories are: (1) strategies employed to achieve core program goals and objectives, which include themes of international action and solidarity, popular education, training and support for TEN DAYS global educators, and the focus on youth; (2) effectiveness of global education strategies and ongoing challenges, especially financial constraints and the restructuring issue; and (3) increased understanding and solidarity, with themes related to decision-making models, the influence or impact of TEN DAYS on program participants, and identifying constituencies and global education, that is, recognizing who is affected by and who has an interest in addressing the issues and concerns of global education. The intersection of the three data sources (TEN DAYS background documents, primary interview data, and the academic literature on development and global education) provides an opportunity to weave critical reflection into each section of the participants' contributions to the study.

From the outset, there was recognition of the "need within TEN DAYS for a research and consultation base" as demonstrated by meetings in 1973 with (then) GATT-fly and the Taskforce on the Churches and Corporate Responsibility (TCCR). The development of the Action Program and the 1983 shift in theme to Central America encouraged formalization of relations with other InterChurch coalitions, including the InterChurch Committee on Human Rights in Latin America (ICCHRLA), for example, which could provide a comprehensive research base for issues of concern and importance and urgency (Larson, 1988, p. 100-101). Limited resources and the need to avoid duplication led to a pattern of sharing between coalitions which has been carried forward to the present. Indeed, with recent changes and the establishment of the new KAIROS umbrella organization, the pattern has been institutionalized.

The programme themes of TEN DAYS are intended to advance the focus on broad issues of

world development education, rather than duplicate the work of issue-specific organizations. The themes must have "pedagogical potential . . . able to carry the educational task . . . and to put a human face on complex and seemingly theoretical issues." Preferred themes are those which "seize the historical moment" and capture the essence of "what is pressing on the global social consciousness at a particular time" while avoiding the temptations of "faddism" (Larson, 1988, p. 138). However, the importance of discerning the times may be subordinated to the "obligation to make choices based not just on pedagogical potential but on what will best serve the needs of the people of the Two Thirds World . . . . broadening opportunities for human growth . . . [hence] the themes of TEN DAYS are carefully chosen because of their historical necessity and pedagogical potential" (pp. 140-141). The selection of specific TEN DAYS programme themes is determined through a participatory process by the faith community involved; a process which is central in the TEN DAYS approach to global education.

The organizational strategies of TEN DAYS are based on the goals and objectives outlined in Chapter Four. The specific strategies are: (1) to focus on the Canadian public as the primary constituency; (2) to use institutional churches as a catalyst to "initiate and engage in dialogue and action with others"; (3) to form local reflection-action groups to focus on specific issues of local concern; (4) to ensure that "the churches' response to social issues would be specific and issues-based . . . . emphasiz[ing] the principle of action strategy over institutional organization within the interChurch work"; (5) to develop public policy in concert with other segments of Canadian society, and with specific recognition of the importance of research and action regarding the links between international and domestic poverty (Larson, 1988, pp. 57-61).

The strategies are a continuation of earlier church-labour initiatives to cooperate and collaborate in addressing pressing social issues of the day; focusing on labour, management, and government. Nationally, in the 1940s there was the Religion-Labour Foundation, followed by the Religion-Labour Council in 1959. By the mid-1960s, there were two principle foci for the emerging development education initiative: to have Christian denominational churches speaking as one on social issues, and contextualizing theological debate, focusing on concrete issues in the lifeworld. In 1965 the National Committee on the Church and Industrial Society (NCCIS) provided a basis or model for the later interChurch coalitions, such as TEN DAYS, through "its ad-hoc, issue-oriented and coalition-sensitive response capacity within the context of ongoing theological reflection" (Larson, 1988, pp. 55-56).

An overview of the historical timeline for TEN DAYS and the themes from 1973 to 2001 reflect a coherent approach to education for action and reflection leading to further informed action. It is consistent with both a secular view of popular and participatory education as well as the *praxis* model of theological reflection, action and further reflection upon which the TEN DAYS programme is based. The complete timeline is in the December 1996 Special 25th Anniversary Issue of *Update, 3* (2).

In 1973 Church leaders of Presbyterian, Lutheran, United, Roman Catholic & Anglican (PLURA) Churches toured eight Canadian cities speaking to the theme, *Development Demands Justice.* Their aim was to get media attention, to address government officials and to call for public involvement in the formation of Canadian policy around development issues. The seeds for the basis of TEN DAYS were sown in that first program: high profile speakers, the visitor program, educational resource materials, and locally-based groups, calling Canadians to participate in discussions and formation of public policy.

From 1974-79 there was a focus on "Why the Churches Can't Stay Out" of development issues and "If Hunger is Present, God is Not Present", reflecting the ongoing concern for the theological base of the TEN DAYS program.

In 1980-81 there was a Shift from "food" to the "Work - Making a Living" theme and TEN DAYS defined itself as a focused education program building to specific actions.

From 1982-85 the focus was on aid and human rights in Central America, changing Canadian policy in the region, and participatory or "popular" education.

1986-88 saw calls for more support around a "spirituality of justice-making," how to keep hope alive, how to nourish participants, and how to ground their work in hope.

The 1989-92 action program confronted Canadian banks' international debt policies and examined the impact of structural adjustment programs and conditionalities.

1993-97 was a period of re-examination of the entire program, mission and values, leading to re-mandating of the program by the PLURA churches in Fall, 1995. CIDA funding was cut in March, 1995, then recouped in the summer after strong grassroots letter-writing and intervention by the churches. The program was renamed, TEN DAYS for Global Justice, to

reflect an evolving understanding of global reality, focus on alternatives and celebration of 25th program year in 1997.

1998-2001 saw continued preoccupation with funding constraints and concerns regarding the process of restructuring the InterChurch coalitions, culminating in the formation of a new umbrella organization to be known as the KAIROS - Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives. TEN DAYS was integrated into KAIROS.

These topics or motifs which TEN DAYS has focused on show a consistent awareness of the links between Justice, International Trade, Development, and the International Economic Order, particularly 1973 - 1976. For a number of years (1977-1990) issues of debt, trade, and global economic structures were somewhat submerged as concerns such as hunger and unemployment generally, and the inhuman, anti-development practices ravaging the people of Central America specifically, were the foci of TEN DAYS education and action. Toward the end of of the 1980s, however, the systemic causes of injustice, poverty, and hunger, and their disproportionate impact on women, were again linked to the workings of the global economy. By 1986, "Third World partners had identified the debt crisis as one of the root causes of hunger and challenged Canadians to educate themselves and push for just policies in Canada in relation to the debt" (TEN DAYS 1992 Education-Action Guide, p. 30). During the 1990s, Debt, development and democracy, issues of gender and justice, development and globalization-from-below in the form of FAIR TRADE movements and the growth in support for the International Jubilee/DEBT Campaign were features of the TEN DAYS programme. Now, in the early part of the 21st century, there is a realization that the global economy, international Debt, and issues of human development are so inextricably linked that meaningful distinctions are difficult to make. Thus these topical orientations reflect the changes and continuity of the TEN DAYS approach to global education over a 30-year period and lead to consideration of the categories and themes identified through this study.

Strategies to achieve Core Program Goals and Objectives

This first category emerging from the present study encompasses four themes. The first theme, the international action and solidarity strategy, involves increasing recognition of the links and international interconnectedness (North/South and the South in the North), the effects of globalization, privatization, and structural adjustment programs. It is strengthened through the high profile/Third World Visitor Program and efforts at networking and

solidarity. The second theme, popular education includes the increased accessibility of program resources geared for people at different stages in their exposure to global education which make use of popular education techniques, a focus on specific issues and associated action possibilities. Education, action, and advocacy are integral aspects of this theme. Training and support for TEN DAYS global educators is the third theme in this category which encompasses resource materials, annual regional and provincial training events, support from the national level of TEN DAYS, and support from other interChurch coalitions. The fourth theme is the youth focus, a recognition that the program needs new members, and young people need direction or help in gaining a critical perspective on issues of global justice. Here, the importance of specific program materials, oriented toward an identifiable demographic segment of the Canadian population and the constituency of potential TEN DAYS supporters, is strongly emphasized.

International Action and Solidarity
High profile/Third World Visitor Program
This is one of the highly-regarded aspects of the TEN DAYS Program and "has accomplished two purposes: Third World visitors have presented development issues to the Canadian public via the mass media in a high-profile way, and they have offered a Third World perspective to Canadian understanding and analysis of Third World issues." The position of TEN DAYS organizers was that if they were "serious about addressing educational issues, it was also necessary to listen to and to hear what people in the Third World were saying" (Larson, 1988, pp. 141-142).

Ruth, one of the study participants, commented that *"networking with international peoples' movements and inviting guest speakers from their organizations is of particular importance."* She added that this program
> *has accomplished two purposes. Third World visitors have presented development issues to the Canadian public via the mass media in a high-profile way, and they have offered a Third World perspective to Canadian understanding and analysis of Third World issues.* (26 July 2000)

Two general types of visitors are deemed necessary to the goals of the programme: first, the high-profile visitor aimed at the national level for broadest exposure, and second, the regional visitors who encourage dialogue with local committees and other members of the community. For educational purposes, it is especially important to hear Third World views and analyses of development issues, particularly, as Paul put it, from
> *the people who come to talk about the specific focus of the program which is covered by the material. We can read the material but when someone with personal experience speaks to us we can believe that person who knows the*

situation and take some action on the issue or concern. (6 July 2000)

Third World visitors were, initially, exclusively residents or citizens of South countries. Then, from time to time, residents or citizens of Canada whose origins were in the Third World, and who could speak to particular issues from personal experience, were invited to participate in the Third World Visitors Program. More recently, with growing budget constraints, strong demand for Visitors in numerous sectors of the TEN DAYS network, and recognition of the "South in the North," another category of "visitor" has been added to the roster: members of First Nations communities, and representatives of anti-poverty organizations, oppressed, marginalized groups such as the homeless. Connecting the local and the global, hearing Canadian community perspectives on issues of poverty, greatly strengthens the relevance of the education for action initiatives. As Mary explained it,

> *The visitor program has always been a key component of TEN DAYS. It allows for face-to-face interaction which is part of the pedagogy, of that understanding. Bringing a visitor in needs to be part of a broader program. Today, as more people from the South are living in Canada we have a much greater pool of resource people right here who have some understanding of the Canadian context. More local groups are beginning to realize they know someone local who can act as a resource person. It can become an on-going relationship--connecting the local with the global: visitors speaking about aboriginal issues or local poverty.* (30 May 2000)

Commenting further on the need to encourage connectedness, and linking of issues, Rachel agreed that

> *The personal connections, where people see themselves as part of a larger whole, are invaluable. Without the visitor program there's a real danger of losing those international threads that bind us and tie us. Maintaining that visitor program within a much more constrained budget may be difficult. It pushes us to seek other groups to network with that are doing visitor programs; both international visitors and people from within marginalized segments of our own society who can be utilized as 'Third World visitors'.* (17 September 2000)

This practice of linking people--local and international--with the issues can develop into on-going community relationships with healthy and positive implications for education, action and change. The direct contact with people who have personal experience and views on development issues, concerns, strategies that many Canadians can only read about or glimpse briefly on television, is valuable. "Official" positions, from Church or state, can differ rather dramatically from those of persons differently situated in global and local systems of social stratification. As the pressures and effects of globalization-from-above have increased on North countries over time, it is often less necessary to consult a "Third World" visitor to interpret the effects of structural adjustment and privatization; we are experiencing it first-hand in Canada.

Networking and Solidarity

All participants agreed networking is central to TEN DAYS. Mary summarized the general point of view:

> This is an overall TEN DAYS strategy with an emerging youth focus. We have connected with WUSC (World University Services Canada) around sweat-shop issues TEN DAYS provides focused education and action to engage target groups especially within churches but with a much stronger emphasis on networking with others in the community who are engaged in similar issues; working together, sharing resources, and taking collective action, combining both strategies and the youth initiative. (30 May 2000)

For Sarah, networking is supported by the *"Newsletter that comes out three or four times a year which is quite useful, as are the North-South linkages which help support global justice and the Jubilee campaign"* (26 June 2000).

Paul pointed out that

> A number of people subscribe to our program material, the quarterly bulletin, including the faith resource, and the PLURA churches that are involved in TEN DAYS get this material. The key strategy is trying to reach out to the local committees through the publications and through the denominations to promote the programs of TEN DAYS. This leaves out the churches which are beyond the PLURA ones, but the local committees' programs can reach out to the general public. (6 July 2000)

Ruth concurred that

> networking in Canada, and internationally, with development organizations and peoples' movements is an important part of the TEN DAYS strategy, especially networking with international people's movements and inviting guest speakers from their organizations. TEN DAYS is good at listening and finding ways to focus our education and action programs on their assessment of needs and viable solutions. Cooperation with and creative use of media organizations is also important. (26 July 2000)

Rachel's position is that

> networking through committee work and regional gatherings is effective, as is networking of information resources such as linking local committees with the Jubilee initiative newsletter, so there is constant interchange of information from one social justice group to another. Each local committee is strongly encouraged to send a representative to the regional gatherings to network with other committee people. (17 September 2000)

In the area of networking, solidarity and linkages with like-minded groups and organizations, TEN DAYS has much to give and also needs to be supported through reciprocal arrangements; participation in mutual aid, strength in numbers. On the importance of this point, Sarah commented that,

> solidarity and linkages relate to how what happens elsewhere affects us here so

there's recognition of local issues and concerns which need to be addressed as well as recognition of similarities between local conditions and those in other parts of the world. The goals of education and action become somewhat more realizable. Education becomes more relevant. (26 June 2000)

On a cautionary note regarding increasing reliance on networking via electronic communication, Sarah pointed out that while

the way education is going it's becoming a necessary thing for us to be able to access resources from the internet , and it is less expensive, if there are resource people to put it on at the other end, however, if we go the internet route it can be isolating for some people; not everyone is comfortable or familiar with, or even have that opportunity to use the internet. It might attract more younger people; the older people will have to rely on others who are comfortable with it to provide them with the resources. (26 June 2000)

Ruth observed that, bearing in mind the limits, not everyone has access,

there is a benefit from working at the national level and at the local level at the same time. People in the national office who are able to focus on national government policy issues and people from local committees are able to speak to MLAs directly. Because we have a national office closely connected to committees across the country we can mobilize in a matter of days. (26 July 2000)

In addition, more could and should be done in solidarity with groups involved in similar issues. It is Ruth's opinion that *"others can learn from TEN DAYS' use of international networking, with international peoples' movements around the world. Bringing international speakers to Canada is always effective; it's always a highlight"* (26 July 2000). In this context, ecumenism and interfaith linkages also need to be emphasized. Even though, as Paul said,

it's difficult to do. We just have to try. There are many similar groups doing this sort of work but slightly different, and as for TEN DAYS, the part they do needs to be done. The churches need this sort of project in any case. The committees bring together people from different denominations and this has an ecumenical effect which is good. (6 July 2000)

Networking locally, regionally, nationally, and international cooperation strengthen the power, position of partners and movements. Local-global networking is enhanced by growing use of electronic communication technology and is an example of how globalization or development-from below is able to make appropriate use of the same technology that, for example, permits the international currency speculators to carry on their activities. Networking, coalition building, moving beyond the confines of the institutional church, has been one of the primary goals of TEN DAYS and, as we are "increasingly able to see the world as one complex and contradictory capitalist whole (rather than as divided into a homogeneous West opposed to a homogeneous East, or Three Worlds, or North and South, similarly homogeneous and opposed)" (Waterman, 1993, p. 259), so are we able to

appreciate the importance of linking with supportive elements, wherever they may be, local or global. Globalization from below is fostered by an organizational form sometimes called "international civil society, NGOs, or international advocacy networks" (Brecher, Costello, & Smith, 2000, p. 81). As well as NGOs, these networks include

> local social movements, foundations, the media, churches, trade unions, consumer organizations, intellectuals, parts of regional and international inter-governmental organizations, and parts of the executive and/or parliamentary branches of governments . . . . [and] have become the main vehicle through which the campaigns of globalization from below have been organized. (pp. 83-84)

Networking and solidarity has been an important element regarding external challenges to TEN DAYS. The primary response of TEN DAYS has been through publicity, judicious use of, and cooperation with, the news media and mobilizing public pressure and promoting greater awareness of issues and concerns. There has been a collective ecumenical, networked response to the issues and concerns through community and organizations over time. Ruth's view is that, at this moment of re-structuring,

> *of all the ecumenical coalitions TEN DAYS is in the best position to change an unfavourable decision because we have representatives from all the churches, all across the country, ready to write letters, make phone calls, fax, e-mail, speak to our church leaders, and we have experience in doing it. We can be mobilized in three days. There are people who think that even if TEN DAYS is drastically cut back it will survive because there are so many people across the country who want the organization to work and one way or another will keep it going in whatever format we can.* (26 July 2000)

Rachel also stressed the importance of networking to the continued existence of TEN DAYS:

> *Church housekeeping and politics are very strong obstacles in the future of TEN DAYS. They have been obstacles in the past but with a strong representation from the network they have been overcome. In any case, without the network the program just isn't going to happen.* (17 September 2000)

Other ways of overcoming challenges are to make resource materials more usable, cut costs regarding regional and national meetings and linking programs, as Paul suggested,

> *so that when you're putting on a presentation or workshop you can relate it to the local situation. For example, with farming, in rural Alberta the farm situation in a Third World country can be linked to problems people are having here. If you can get people to come to the meetings you can give them your message. This can help reduce apathy. As people look at what globalization is doing to the Third World they can relate it to what its doing to us here. What happens elsewhere hurts us here. When people grow all their produce for export and no food for themselves, what are are the implications?* (6 July 2000)

Ruth offered further suggestions and observations for overcoming problems, such as:

> *creative funding and restructuring of program as well as national staffing. We've begun, in the past few years, to target youth for our programming: (1) youth have*

energy, vitality, and a social conscience, and (2) to combat the aging of our current people we need younger people to take over. We also go to media quite often to overcome apathy. (26 July 2000)

Ruth also voiced a consistent observation or theme running through the interviews with study participants, which was that,

probably the best tool we have for overcoming any of these obstacles is the international guests that we bring to Canada. *We invite the media to report on these guests; they're more interested in people than they are in things, and it's an opportunity for Third World people to face Canadian people, to answer questions from their personal experience, to give us a picture of their personal experience, to show that they have the same hopes and expectations.* (26 July 2000)

Mary pointed to another

element of spirituality that sustains and gives the foundation to the people who are involved in the work of TEN DAYS is a real evolution that it expand to be inter-faith. Many of the local committees are inter-faith and are not just the five mainline churches which still allows a spiritual element and a respect for one another's faith tradition to be part of that. That is part of the networking. (30 May 2000)

In the end, at the base, are the local committees and communications between them, where, as Ruth observed,

another method of overcoming obstacles is by contacting governments or corporations who are contributing to the problems we seek to address, through letter writing, e-mail, personal contact, telephone. We communicate with our congregations, we do community programs for the public, and invite the general public and actively let people know what's going on, and what's wrong about it and what needs to be done to make it right. That's probably the first thing TEN DAYS does when there may be a funding crunch, they go to the local communities and ask what should be done. The ideas can then be communicated from one end of the country to the other and people can get in motion. (26 July 2000)

Ruth added that, in the context of funding, the participatory nature of TEN DAYS is a strength:

When funding is precarious it's particularly valuable that TEN DAYS is participatory; that everybody who is a volunteer, part of the TEN DAYS program, has a say in what happens, in the decisions that are made. There is a high degree of perceived ownership of the project(s). (26 July 2000)

Reiterating the centrality of scriptural integrity to support for TEN DAYS, Ruth and others emphatically stressed that the preeminence of the theological basis is nowhere more evident than in the

implications for funding from churches and other organizations which may not agree with the overall direction of TEN DAYS programming: we are always very careful to keep the program theologically sound. It is always a challenge not to compromise one's values and the quality of the work in order to secure the funding. (26 July 2000)

Ruth went on to say that opposition arises for reasons other than theological, so the most effective strategy for those who disagree with TEN DAYS is to ignore it, to marginalize it, to exclude it from the mainstream activities of the church. Therefore,

> *because the funding is precarious, and because TEN DAYS is a church-based organization, it is exceeding important that the theology be sound, and obvious, and that there are Bible study and worship resources provided. The weakness is with committee members who don't feel comfortable or adequately prepared to lead the Bible study, for example. However, it is available; and it is a central part of the program. In the resources and in the training the theology is front and centre. But in the local committees some are more comfortable with that than others. (26 July 2000)*

The importance of a secure funding base is evident in the 1995 *Agreement to Re-Mandate*:

> It is recognized that there are some uncertainties regarding the future funding levels for TEN DAYS from its sponsoring churches and CIDA. In order to ensure its future viability TEN DAYS is committed to exploring strategies for diversifying its funding. It has been agreed that TEN DAYS' strategies for diversifying funding will be designed to ensure that they will not have an adverse impact on the fund raising activities of the sponsoring churches and their development agencies. It has also been agreed that core funding for the TEN DAYS program will continue to be based on the contributions of its sponsoring churches. (p. 5)

The important sense of solidarity and commitment to a good and worthwhile cause expressed by study participants, the combination of realism and hopeful determination to continue the struggle, were distinctive characteristics evident in the concern to keep TEN DAYS going, in some form. Beyond agreement with "the view that transnational capital has escaped from democratic accountability and needs to be brought back under citizen control" (Parkland, 2002, p. 3), there is also the strong sense that TEN DAYS is part of "the emergence or re-emergence of the concept of global civil society" (Hall, 2000, p. 20).

> There is a common "feeling of a loss of state sovereignty," being part of the dramatic growth in NGOs . . . and the subsequent networking amongst those organizations on a regional and global basis [and] the growing sense of urgency towards finding a semi-autonomous global political space [because of] the growing disillusionment with the global market itself. (p. 20)

Popular Education

Education, Action, and Advocacy

There is a clear consensus amongst interview participants that the overall TEN DAYS plan is one of education, action and advocacy. Mary elaborated, saying,

> *one of the strategies of TEN DAYS is popular and participatory education. We have user-friendly resources; training is provided in the use of the resources, and experiential learning techniques of popular and participatory education are employed. The educational and action materials are designed to engage people. Rather than a lecture-style or expert-style model where somebody knows the information and tells other people, popular and participatory education starts*

> with what people know. It does some contextual analysis--where are we, what do we know, how does this affect us? The assumption is that whoever is involved has experience and understanding which they bring with them and are challenged by listening to other people, listening to Southern partners, listening to experiences that they themselves haven't had. That is participatory education. And, there needs to be an action component, which has sometimes been an obstacle for TEN DAYS. There needs to be empowerment to move beyond hearing about the injustice, or even experiencing an injustice, to taking the next step of doing something. (30 May 2000)

For Rachel,

> the real trick to global education is to find a way to connect the larger issues that we try to work with with individual people living in a different context. For instance, it's trying to get the middle class North American mom to make the connection between herself and the woman working sixteen hours a day in a garment factory in El Salvador. All of those personal connections are what make people feel motivated to go out and do something about it or to talk to other people about it. (17 September 2000)

Material is also designed to be used by young people to ask those same kinds of questions. Focused action and education are essential components of this approach, where people, including youth, can see how their actions have a direct impact. Again, drama was mentioned as having been found to be especially effective.

Rachel also observed that has been

> an emphasis on providing program materials for differing age groups. There are children's workshops for Sunday Schools and younger classrooms. The focus though has been on the young adults and that requires getting into the university campuses to international development or global education classes. We did do a curriculum package for the junior-senior high school levels that went through the Alberta curriculum requirements for grades eight to twelve and then tried to draw connections with that particular year's program and feed them right into the curriculum so that teachers had very concrete exercises to do within the curriculum that related to these issues. (17 September 2000)

Both individual and collective action can be outcomes of popular education approaches. *"Over the years actions have changed from simply writing letters to actually, for example, meeting face-to-face with the bankers; moving into the corporate world"* (Mary, 30 May 2000). This orientation is clearly laid out in the thematic priority areas of the KAIROS ecumenical partnership. Sarah describes the process from the TEN DAYS perspective:

> an ecumenical local group uses the resource material from national office on Ten Days for Global Justice. We study a certain theological rationale to see how it relates to the global picture and also identify a similar local situation or action that we could support here in our own community. Whether it is the wages or labor conditions of factory workers in Edmonton or wages and conditions of people in so-called Third World factories, we make the connections and try to educate people as to how we participate in the lives of others across the world.

We also do some action, education, and awareness raising; at the City and the Strathcona Markets, handing out literature, or a fashion show downtown. We targeted some cafes and asked them to offer fair-traded coffee to their customers. Each member of the ecumenical group has their own congregation or group, which relates to their situation and takes actions as necessary. (26 June 2000)

Actions need to be realistic and achievable, both in the short-term and the long-term. They need to be something people can do now, where they are in their understanding and awareness of issues at this moment, given their current capacity to act on that understanding. As Paul explains it,

some groups find it easier to do the education part than some of the action; outrageous action (such as running a tape from the banks to a food bank, action where you're a public nuisance, for example). Some groups do better than others by having their MPs/MLAs come to the meetings, for example. (6 July 2000)

It is the beginning of a longer-term process, which is *"what TEN Days really tries to do-- first raise the awareness and then give people a focused place to act when they come to that point."* Paul goes on to explain that

As well as working through the local committees and their publications TEN DAYS are working with the Canadian government and we've have had a bit of success. We were talking about fair trade and CIDA; Fair Trade coffee. Some have said that the Fair Traded coffee project might have collapsed if TEN DAYS hadn't promoted it when they did. Regarding the sweatshops, we had petitions to set up a task force which were presented to Lloyd Axworthy in June 1998. TEN DAYS distributed 60,000 cards which were mailed in to Axworthy and other ministers. The TEN DAYS campaign was at the right time.

Now TEN DAYS is approaching department stores selling things made in China with slave labor. In this case, TEN DAYS distributed 65,000 cards; as a public action, handing them out at the Farmers' Market, and people will read and be informed whether they act on them or not. You can't really say how many people have been influenced, but you can say we sent out 65,000 cards for this and 60,000 for that; maybe five people read one card. We also had a program on Vision TV about coffee, in 1998. How many thousands of people saw that? (6 July 2000)

The current campaign, Right Relations with Aboriginal Peoples and Right Relations with the Earth, focusing on land rights issues and climate change, seeks to alert more people to the need for immediate action. The Ten Days for Global Justice Website lists action campaigns and strategies, resources, and links with other organizations working on Debt Cancellation, Poverty Elimination and Canadian Export Development Corporation accountability.

Resources from National office, including the theological rationale for particular actions, themes and ideas which link the global picture to the local, are of practical value to the local ecumenical groups as they participate in and promote action, education and awareness raising. Rachel commented on differing perceptions about approaches to youth involvement

and the need for local committees *to let young people take the program materials and gear something to their own needs and their own ideas of what their peers can work with, allow them ownership of that part of their program* (17 September 2000).

In part because youth involvement on local committees has been difficult TEN DAYS has tried to emphasize to adult committees that when they have a group of young people involved there is a need to encourage a certain degree of independence in program direction and design. Rachel pointed out that

> *this year in particular the whole program will be geared toward youth (college and university-aged, or young adults, as opposed to elementary, junior or senior high school students) with adaptations for older people. There's a wide divergence of opinion about the age at which it is appropriate to introduce these materials and to work with young people.* (17 September 2000)

Strategies for working with youth have different entry points and it is Rachel's view that there needs to be

> *more emphasis placed on educating youth or raising awareness at many different entry points. I would like to see more work being done with elementary school students. Children's opinions and future habits are formed by the time they're eight years old and the more awareness we can create within that group of kids, to empower them as young people to do things when they're very young so they feel they have the power to make changes.* (17 September 2000)

The importance of the need to focus on early empowerment of children and youth is also highlighted, linking with organizations like Girl Guides, early school social studies curricula, and so forth. Likewise, as Rachel observed,

> *TEN DAYS should have a very focused Sunday School (Children's Church) program for the member denominations. Part of the difficulty of motivating people to stand up against injustice is that these issues are often not touched upon when they are children in the church. Along with caring and compassion are included our abilities to change the structures that govern the way a lot of the world lives. The reason for taking children to church is to teach them how to live in God's kingdom, as children of God, so why not teach them how to actually do that in the world and not just within the confines of their own Sunday School class or their own home but how to go out in the world and really do that?* (17 September 2000)

The TEN DAYS approach to popular education is closely aligned with a process based on the work of Paulo Freire, with substantial contributions from Antonio Gramsci and Julius Nyerere, and adapted to the Canadian context. Two important steps in this approach are the need to build a "critical self-knowledge" based on recognition and awareness of individual social, organizational and political identities and assessing the situation, that is, "considering how our identities have been moulded historically, rather than treating those identities as static and personal." The purpose of assessing the situation is to better understand the importance of "the broader social context in the work," particularly the historical context

and the social analysis necessary to changing power relations (Arnold, Burke, James, Martin, & Thomas, 1991, pp. 10-22). Building a critical self-knowledge clarifies the process of assessing the situation, when social, organizational and educational identities are recognized. The distinctions between three basic political approaches to educational research and practice relate to different paradigms of development and development education.

The Conservative approach is dominant or hegemonic and the content "is the worldview and experience of the elites, which all others are expected to appreciate, if not emulate . . . the function is to maintain the legitimacy of the status quo." The emphasis on "expertise" tends to
> trivialize or dismiss outright the life experience of learners. This requires labelling certain uses of language as correct, certain kinds of knowledge as valuable. When the social identity of the learners is different from the dominant group in race, class, gender, religion, or culture, they must be made to feel that their ideas are primitive and their aspirations *unrealistic*. Then they will be fully open to the imposition of conservative education. (Arnold, et al., 1991, p. 20)

Liberal approaches, according to Arnold, et al. (1991), draw on classical humanism, the emphasis is on individualism, self-directed learning and social reform and "the focus is on attitudes rather than structures, on the individual rather than the collectivity, on personal growth rather than transformation . . . . Liberal adult educators will undertake to improve unjust situations but avoid tackling the root causes of injustice" (p. 21). Life skills are important, power inequities are avoided but there is an implicit paternalism. "The strength of this approach is its insight into human potential and individual diversity, and its resistance to manipulative teaching practices." At the same time, liberal approaches studiously avoid issues of power relations. The "resolute naivete" reflected in the view that education is neutral flies in the face of reality where "individuals are socially situated in an unequal world" (p. 21).

The third type is transformational approaches which range, in theory and practice, from "most participatory to most top-down or *vanguardist* . . . . In transformational approaches, education is part of a movement for individual and collective liberation, which promotes learning for critical consciousness and collective action. Such education seeks to transform power relations in society, relations between teacher and learner, and relations among learners. In this sense it is radically democratic." Content focuses on "the situation of oppression and the possible strategies for social change" and the method "begins with the lived experience of the learners, with validating it and exploring, through dialogue, its

humanizing as well as oppressive dimensions. The method then moves to collective discussion about action, to the possibilities of transforming the oppressive elements of experience" (Arnold, et al., p. 22).

For TEN DAYS the emphasis has been on an approach which is transformative and participatory where the "content of social analysis is possibilities, their shape and extent" and focuses on uncovering power relations. The four areas of content (Arnold, et al., pp. 25-30) or phases in "the process of political analysis for action or naming the moment" (Barndt, 1989, pp. 27, 24-53) are:

      1. Identifying ourselves and our interests, the social, organizational, and political dimensions of identity.

      2. Naming the issues/struggles, identifying or naming what matters.

      3. Assessing the forces, or "conjunctural analysis" (Arnold, et al., p. 27).

      4. Planning for action which involves:
evaluating past actions to assess which strategies worked well and why; reviewing the shifts in forces in the past, anticipating future shifts, and assessing the 'free space' in the present moment; identifying strategies that build on our strengths, take advantage of their weaknesses, and tap the uncommitted; selecting the most effective strategies, by evaluating the constraints and possibilities of those proposed; proposing new tactical alliances and how to build them; and considering how this moment can be used to move toward both short-term and longer-term objectives. (Barndt, 1989, p. 46)

The "methods of analysis [must be] consistent with the ways we educate. This involves engaging with others, creating analysis with others, celebrating discovery of ideas, acknowledging that struggle is a teacher . . . . In particular, we want to emphasize the importance of broadening the in-crowd of sources for social analysis. When dealing with organizations, this means listening to people at the bottom of the heap" (Arnold, et al., p. 28).

The tool, the "Naming the Moment" Approach, "began in the tradition of 'conjunctural analysis', particularly as developed in Latin America . . . . [and is now] a flexible, participatory, imaginative process, suited particularly to the needs and cultures of popular organizations in Canada" (Arnold, et al. pp. 28-29). Strengths of the approach include comprehensiveness, it "helps us to see what makes a situation an opportunity, providing the elements of timing and readiness that are so often lost in more detached social analysis approaches;" dynamism, encouraging the "cultural dynamics in a situation;" inclusiveness, in that "the experience and insight of those directly engaged in social action work carry the same weight as those who observe it. People of different social, organizational, and

educational identities can all contribute to a total picture, which they then all *own;*" and it is fun, energizing.

Power analyses include recognition of the need to share it. Power relations for social change educators include information power, connection power, expert power, position power, personality power, and network power, are all related to social identities, the simple fact of being (or not being) part of a particular social group (Arnold, et al., pp. 151-162). Future challenges facing social change educators include understanding the distinction between dominant and popular agendas, because

> in a political and socio-economic system that benefits some people more than others
> .... Those with wealth and power strive to maintain a position of privilege, and their
> decisions help shape the direction our society takes. Theirs is a dominant agenda: it
> operates from a position of power .... [which changes through] inter-elite rivalries
> as economic empires collide. (p. 168)

On the other hand, the popular agenda "can and does develop its own vision of a future society that will benefit the majority. . . . [it is] sometimes deeply divided .... [and] its quota of power starts from nil and increases slowly with the level of organization and determination." It is important to recognize that democratic practice is the foundation, not an afterthought:

> Part of the role we can play as educators is to uncover the often hidden
> components of the dominant agenda and help to strengthen the organizing
> efforts of the popular sector. Though supportive, we can't be uncritical of
> any popular agenda that simply exchanges one oppressive structure for
> another. This is the essence of our concern about democratic practice being
> built into organizations while they are still in opposition. The way we work
> today will be an indication of the society we will build tomorrow. (Arnold, et
> al., p. 168)

Education and empowerment in popular education relate to the value and importance of providing opportunities for creatively harnessing and directing the energy, passion and commitment people often have and feel in the face of injustices. A central consideration is that this be done in such a way that people are able to recognize the scope of relevant issues, concerns, problems and the degree of urgency associated with them, yet not be overwhelmed by feelings of powerlessness and hopelessness. From Paul's perspective,

> *The reasons persons are in underprivileged situations should be meaningful to us*
> *here. Why are these things happening? If we can determine the reasons, which*
> *may have to do with land ownership or civil war, if we can understand the reasons*
> *then we can be wiser in making our estimations and judgments here. We may be*
> *able to see similarities with what's happening here as well.* (6 July 2000)

Ruth further suggested that TEN DAYS offers people an avenue for meaningful involvement in addressing important issues.

Empowerment is one of the strengths of TEN DAYS. The process of how we function, the strategies, the resources, that we use, all of that is geared toward empowering people to make changes. Themselves first and then to be a model for other people; and to make demands of them, to have expectations of people, but also to empower them and nurture them to be able to meet those demands and expectations.

The expectations are reasonable. There is a range of involvement that people can take on so that there is a measure of success no matter how heavily you get involved. There is a measure of success at whatever level you're at. There are appropriate levels of nurture, so that people aren't burnt out. There have been a few people who have gotten tired but there aren't many that have burnt out in TEN DAYS, the way there are in a number of other values-based organizations. There's not the same turnover in TEN DAYS, in the national office or amongst the committees that you see in other organizations. I think that's a positive implication. (26 July 2000)

In Rachel's view, the deliberate, intentional hands-on, action-oriented approach which TEN DAYS has adopted in recent years has been effective.

TEN DAYS has learned as an organization that the more interactive the program the better the understanding of the participants. In its action component we work very specifically to engage people in this kind of interactive process whether it's within the context of a regional gathering and role playing and workshops, or whether it's sending them out into the world to write letters or put on a sweatshop fashion show. As participants go through these interactive elements their understanding seems to become much greater than if they had just sat there and listened to someone lecture. We also see this when we look at the elements of our resource packages in the past couple of years: drama has been a huge element that has been demanded by the network committees themselves. The fashion show, the skits, the plays are things that people go out and do and they can immerse themselves in the issues and in doing so gain a much greater and deeper understanding.

TEN DAYS has learned over the years, because that action and interactive component wasn't always an element within the program. There wasn't always an action to go along with the educational component. It's one thing to tell a person about a recipe; it's another to give the ingredients to them to actually cook it and feel what's involved, what the result is and how it's perceived by those who would like to eat it. So even in recent years there has been more and more emphasis on the use of these kinds of interactive educational tools (17 September 2000).

Program Resources

Another, very important, part of the TEN DAYS strategy is the development and application of "user-friendly" program material, including distinctly faith-based program resource materials. TEN DAYS and the other inter-church coalitions have long been strong in research areas, providing background information and supportive materials to explain various facets of an issue or concern. This strongly academic, research-oriented approach had limited appeal to many of the busy-with-life, activist-oriented people drawn to local

TEN DAYS committees. During the 1990s, without losing the rigorous, scholarly approach to researching issues and developing action strategies, accessibility to resource materials has been greatly enhanced. An observation common to all the interviews conducted for this study had to do with the overall clarity of the resource materials and the range of action possibilities designed for varying levels of knowledge or awareness of issues, levels of commitment and time constraints, and comprehensive sources of further, more in-depth background information for those with the time and willingness or need to dig deeper.

Participants mentioned the central role of accessible program resources in focusing the energies of people who are already committed to the goals and objectives of the programme; as well as introducing people to the precepts of "applied spirituality." The general feeling, as articulated by Sarah, is that

> *resources are much more focused, better researched and more intentional. We are getting on to e-mail and the internet. The technical / computer age provides quick access to other resources that TEN DAYS can use. It's much faster and easier.* (26 June 2000)

Rachel confirmed that program resources play a major role in helping people decide where to focus.

> *When we are able to say to people, 'here are the issues and here are the tools', they then are free to get involved at whatever level they feel comfortable and capable at. They can decide to use certain tools in a certain way with a particular group of people, and they're more likely to become involved if they're given a number of options. It's important that people feel comfortable with what they're doing. With TEN DAYS, people take the resources back to their local committees where the decisions are made about actions to be taken, where abilities, level of commitment and time available can be assessed. This access to choice encourages more people to become involved.* (17 September 2000)

As regards the initial challenge of getting people involved, Rachel further emphasized the need to understand the value of

> *enabling people to start where they are and the importance of the evaluations in this process - where we find out what people are doing, where their interests and capabilities lie. The next year's program, for example, contains more drama, more children's things, more and shorter workshops. The easier it is for volunteers to get involved the better it's going to be in the long run. What's best is getting people involved, no matter how you do it.* (17 September 2000)

Paul's view is that these resources and program materials feed into the two-pronged strategy of education and action where

> *the key strategy is trying to reach out to the local committees through the publications and through the denominations to promote the programs of TEN DAYS. While this leaves out the churches which are beyond the PLURA ones, the local committees' programs can reach out to the general public.* (6 July 2000)

There are direct contacts, negotiations and information sharing with the Canadian government regarding Fair Trade, CIDA policy, and sweatshop issues (in Canada and abroad), for example. Media campaigns have been effective, such as the 1998 Vision TV program about coffee.

Ruth expressed the general view when she said there is
> *greater use of popular education techniques now. Earlier, the focus was on information, awareness-building, giving people information and letter writing. There was little action, mostly awareness and education. People got tired of learning all this stuff and not knowing what to do with it so now the focus is on action and advocacy and giving people a handle on what they can do, who they can go to, and making the approach to whoever we need to go to easy and clear and effective.* (26 July 2000)

Rachel raised a concern regarding the resources where there has been a recent tendency to try to deal with multiple issues *"as opposed to one, very focused, single, directed issue. A lot of people are finding that very overwhelming."* There may be a need to *"pick just one priority issue or area at a time and to decide that this is what the local committee will focus on."* (17 September 2000).

Accessibility of resource materials, provision of appropriate information / education and action possibilities, sources of additional information, contacts for support, solidarity and coalition and network building--these are central to an education-for-focused-action approach to development education. In popular and participatory approaches, education (1) begins with people's everyday experience, (2) doesn't pretend to be neutral, (3) challenges unequal power relations, (4) encourages equitable participation, (5) encourages collective action for change, (6) models and develops democratic practices, (7) draws on the whole person, (8) has a vision / long term goals, and (9) leads to action (*Stop Sweatshops: Educator's Handbook,* Spring 2000, p.3). In large part, this has been the approach which TEN DAYS has adopted.

Training and Support for TEN DAYS Global Educators

Training and support has always been a concern within TEN DAYS and, in this context interview participants for this study were strongly agreed that resource materials had been significantly improved in recent years, clearly setting out the issues and concerns with a range of possible action strategies and plans. The resource kits prepared for the annual action campaigns are designed to "stand alone" in situations where no further training or orientation to the materials is possible. The materials are also designed in such a way that local committee members are able to conduct a workshop, reflection group or meeting by

simply working through the leadership guides, step-by-step.

Study participants emphasized the role of local committees in the training and support functions in TEN DAYS. Mary affirmed that

> the local TEN DAYS committees do the education and action; that is where TEN DAYS is lived out. In local committees there are usually one or two people who have been involved longer, have a greater awareness, and have greater educational facilities. Their involvement helps develop others leaders. These committees continue to be strong. Committees with only one strong leader often have a tough time when that person leaves. (30 May 2000)

Further accentuating the function meetings of local committees have in training and support, including brainstorming and planning about how to use resources from National office, Rachel observed

> There is a strong commitment of the TEN DAYS organization to ensuring that the grassroots committees are able to animate the program. Otherwise it just wouldn't happen. The people who are talking to the members of their community at large are knowledgeable and can effectively communicate that to other people.
>
> For people who are just getting introduced to social justice issues it's important to speak very clearly to one issue and feel confident and know what you're talking about. That's a very refreshing thing and it empowers people to go further, to be able to talk about one issue with some kind of authority and understanding, makes it possible to expand on that and bring the next issue into it. TEN DAYS does a good job of ensuring that people do know what they're talking about and feel they know what they're talking about. It encourages people to connect with their own feelings about the issues and to articulate that as well. (17 September 2000)

The training and support available through TEN DAYS has been high quality educational information for focused action, presented in an accessible way and in keeping with the usual budgetary constraints. For TEN DAYS participants who are very busy in their daily lives, the training and support is intended to present unadorned social analysis where a theological approach, typically from the prophetic and social justice tradition, helps contextualize both secular and spiritual concerns and considerations. For other participants who require more in-depth information and analysis about specific issues, there are print sources, audio-visual materials, contact information including websites and e-mail addresses and links to other groups and organizations around the world who are involved in the same or similar issues. The NGO/CSO (civil society organization) links are available, as well as government, multilateral, IFIs (international financial institutions), United Nations. The TEN DAYS website is an excellent source of information and guidance to other sources of support of various kinds, however, the local, regional, and national meetings provide the point at which the seriously engaged TEN DAYS participant

can be re-invigorated through personal contact with others.

As early as 1983, Christie pointed out the importance of independent research efforts--the results of which are incorporated into TEN DAYS resource, training and support materials to help "to strengthen the development education network, by keeping it supplied with research, information, and materials" (p. 13).

Resource Materials

The "user-friendliness" of the resource materials was emphasized by everyone, repeatedly. Sarah's remarks were representative of the other participants:

> *I think the resources that have been coming out lately have been focusing much better. Their actions are easier for people to say, OK I can see that, I do that, I can be a part of it. Before, we had long pages of history and research background. It was a lot of reading and people simply didn't do it; it never happened. Printed material doesn't seem to make a lot of difference unless it's a specific action or a sample letter that can be sent to the powers that be in the government or in retail organizations. Direct, action-oriented resources seem to be more effective. Something they can do now, that's simple.* (26 June 2000)

Mary agreed the resource material has changed over the years and that

> *now there is a conscious effort put into providing education for people who are at different levels of understanding, the idea being that for people both their education and time commitments can take on different aspects. Material is designed for people who are new, where they feel 'I can do this because I can understand it'. People who have been involved for a long time need something more in depth, plus here's where you go for further resources. So, it allows people at different levels to be involved.* (30 May 2000)

As well, the resource materials are central to the on-going support for the people who are doing the education, to help develop further skills. Mary's view was that support is

> *mostly done through the style of the resources, which are very user-friendly. There are workshops where you don't have to be an expert, where a learner can conduct the workshop and learn at the same time.* (30 May 2000)

Sarah further observed that the resources have been of

> *better quality in recent years, they are very well done, well-organized and can be used as a guide for the educational activity. They have a faith resource, background information, actions, and examples of how to do action, including sample letters and post cards to mail in. The quarterly newsletter is useful and the Jubilee is a widely supported initiative. The themes of TEN DAYS helped people see the linkages. It's global justice and the Jubilee is about global justice. It makes the linkage for people and the Jubilee resources assist the TEN DAYS themes and the background research.* (26 June 2000)

In Paul's view the resource *" material that is produced is good. It's well-planned and when you put on a public event you learn a lot in the process"* (6 July 2000). Ruth also

noted the increasing user-friendliness of resources, that

there is much less background documentation and much more material of a succinct informational nature. There are articles in combination with worship and workshop opportunities, experiential learning and action options. So they're in smaller pieces and the instructions for how to use this effectively are in the workbook in addition to the fact that someone in each group will have been to the regional meeting and will have experience in how it can be used. This increased user-friendliness has come about especially in the last ten years or so. Implementation of the praxis model throughout the organization's work is critical to the success of the program. (26 July 2000)

In addition, Ruth commented on the

greater use of popular education techniques now. Earlier, with the speakers program for example, the focus was on information, awareness-building; giving people information. The speakers would sometimes share their experience, which was more effective, but the materials were focused on information and letter writing. There was little action, mostly awareness and education. People got tired of learning all this stuff and not knowing what to do with it so action options were introduced. The focus is more and more on the action and advocacy. Giving people a handle on what we can do, who we can go to; making the approach to whoever we need to go to easy and clear and effective. (26 July 2000)

As an example of how resource materials emphasize action and transformation as compared to previously, the material for years 1973-1976 dealt with why development demands justice, a focus on trade in the context of African commodities, and the New International Economic Order. The background material was used as primary source material which participants had to struggle through, and try to make sense of, often when they had a few minutes free from other responsibilities with no opportunity to make the sustained effort necessary to assimilate the material. The quality of the research and information was exemplary but essentially inaccessible. Some argued that the issues were sufficiently complex that an abstruse method of presenting the research was unavoidable. Often, it was not clear if specific actions were warranted or not because the basis for these conclusions was not understood. Perhaps the early focus on a "banking" or expert model of education was justified in order to clarify the links between Justice, Development, Trade and the global economic order, but for most TEN DAYS committee members, there was need for specific action recommendations to defuse the frustration of once being able to recognize a serious problem but not being able to take any concrete action to deal with it.

Today, for seasoned TEN DAYS participants, the focus is on increasingly "sophisticated" analysis and action. The recent TEN DAYS information/action orientation regarding issues of global justice has moved strongly in the direction of linking growing global poverty for the majority, and increased wealth for the few, with a fundamentally unjust global economic

order. The education/action campaign related to the G7/8-IFI-WTO complex is illustrated by the popular education workshop entitled *The G8, globalization, and human security* produced by the Alberta Council for Global Cooperation (ACGC), a coalition of organizations working in development, education, and social justice, which includes TEN DAYS and some of the sponsoring churches. ACGC is part of CCIC (Canadian Council for International Cooperation), as is TEN DAYS / KAIROS at the national level. This workshop is part of a larger CCIC project focusing on issues of human security which, following the United Nations Development Program, "is not a concern with weapons--it is a concern with human life and dignity" (ACGC, 2002, p. 6). The workshop is part of the overall goal of promoting social justice and political literacy through critical analysis of the historical, political, and economic roots of unequal power relations, and promotes effective participation in local democratic processes. The workshop provides introductory information regarding the concept of globalization and alternatives to it, as well as more in-depth materials about the links between the G8 and the IFIs.

Examples of actions which can be taken comprise: boycotting World Bank bonds; University/college No-Sweat and Living wage campaigns; Broad-based coalitions of citizens' groups, (organized labour, Church groups, NGOs, CSOs) organized in opposition to secretive, unrepresentative operations of IFIs, WTO, G8; Drop the Debt / Jubilee 2000 campaign; FAIR TRADE organizations; and the Hemispheric Social Alliance to develop alternative social and economic models in the Western hemisphere. Alternatives to the present G7/8 domination of the global economic and governance system and influence on human interests and security around the world are directly related to demands for the democratization of global economic governance, and could include initiatives such as: no globalization without representation; mandate corporate responsibility; restructure the global financial architecture; debt cancellation, end Structural Adjustment, defend economic sovereignty; prioritize human rights--including economic rights--in trade agreements; promote sustainable development--not consumption--as the key to progress; integrate women's needs in all economic restructuring; build free and strong labour unions internationally and domestically; develop community control over capital; and promote socially responsible investment (ACGC, 2002, pp. H6-H9).

The increased availability of Focused Resource materials designed to appeal to and meet the needs of people who are at different levels of understanding and commitment is seen as very important. Rachel highlights the design of the resources as being much more *"user friendly, aimed at the non-expert popular educator who is learning on the job.*

Information is compiled and laid out in a way that is easy to use." And,
> *there are a number of resources available to local committees to assist them in going out and talking to people, whether it's brochures or handouts or pamphlets. The resource packages contain a lot of those props that illustrate in very simple-to-understand terms the issues that are contained within the program materials. So a person doesn't have to be a student of global development in a structured sense to be able to get a grasp of the issues and communicate it effectively to other people who may not know anything about it.* (17 September 2000)

In the end, of course, it is people, the local committee members themselves, who are the most important resources. This was the unambiguously-expressed view of all interview / study participants.

Annual Regional Training Events

These events, provincial coordinators' meetings, and regional retreats , as Mary explained,*"are designed to have people be able to return to their own settings and live out what they have learned"* (30 May 2000). Regional support people work with local committees to help develop new committees and new skills.

As Rachel described the situation,
> *each local committee is encouraged to send a representative to the regional gatherings to network with other committee people and with national staff, the executive director, the national coordinator, the resource person, or the network development person whose job is to work with the committees across the country. They do all kinds of things within that context, whether it's role playing or workshops or just how to talk to people, to educate people. The regional gatherings are very effective; people are generally well informed and if they don't feel informed they have no hesitation asking questions.* (17 September 2000)

Ruth also pointed to the support educators receive in the form of
> *training in the use of resources, particularly at the annual national and regional retreats. There are user-friendly resources, international guests, networking at all levels, and the liberal use of staff and outside 'experts' (people with experience in specific fields) who are brought in as resource people for those retreats. There is regional representation at the national retreats and local representation at the regional retreats. Every committee in the province has an opportunity to learn how to use the resources effectively in their own communities; to turn that teaching around, because it is experiential, and to be better able to teach the rest of the people involved. Most committees send at least one representative to the annual regional meetings. Ongoing dialogue within the organization and between all segments of it, as well as with our international partners is critical.* (26 July 2000)

National Level Support

National retreats have a similar function as regards *"inspiring, informing and energizing"*

TEN DAYS participants. Rachel outlined the process:

> *The annual representatives' meeting gathers all of the provincial coordinators together with staff, animators, program resource people, where we go over strategies to (a) engage people, (b) improve the program, and (c) empower each other to network in and amongst ourselves as well as with other social justice groups. Those retreats are very inspiring, informative and energizing; the things you need to equip people with in order to go out into the grassroots community and assisting people to go out further into their own communities. It takes a great deal of energy and education to make people feel comfortable in doing that. TEN DAYS is structured like an upside down pyramid, where the grassroots community really does all of the educational work that TEN DAYS puts out in its program materials, the grassroots committees carry that out into the society at large. It's not the individual provincial coordinators that do that job, they assist the committees. The paid program resource people, the three staff people, empower and educate the provincial coordinators and in turn the grassroots network.*
>
> *Within TEN DAYS there has been a great deal of emphasis placed on empowering and educating individual committees and committee members to go out and spread the word. We use regional gatherings that introduce the new program materials and go over past programs to keep people up to date. We use networking of informational resources such as linking local committees with the Jubilee initiative newsletter, so there is a constant interchange of information from one social justice group to another and they do that very well.* (17 September 2000)

The emphasis on establishing and strengthening local committees, ensuring clear, open, vigorous two-way communication and real input and influence in decision-making has long been part of TEN DAYS. Earlier studies (e.g., Larson, 1988) confirm that since 1972, part of the role of national TEN DAYS coordinator was provision of support in the areas of resource development and coordination. Responsibilities included coordinating and planning the TEN DAYS program, producing and distributing resources, and organizing and relating to local committees. In 1976 the position of National Fieldworker was established; responsibilities included:

1. to establish and assist community and regional committees,
2. to link local committees to each other and to the National committee,
3. to help local committees relate to local congregations,
4. to assist where possible, in planning of a national emphasis,
5. to keep records of denominational activity, and to assist the national staff and the board to maintain contact with the denominations,
6. to represent the needs and wishes of the local committees at the national level, and
7. to be in touch with the national political scene.

During that same time, increased CIDA funding was being made available for regional allocation and there were repeated calls for local inter-church animateurs (Larson, 1988, pp. 81-84).

By 1981, there were too many local TEN DAYS committees and requests for support for

the National Fieldworker to handle adequately. As a result, part of an Action Program of the day "emphasized the importance of a trained local committee base" and in 1984 the Program Facilitator became a permanent salaried position. In 1987 the position of Coordinator for Leadership Development and Regional Communications was established, with "primary responsibility in the area of development and support of regional and sub-regional structures, leadership training, and relating to other sectors of Canadian society. For the first time, linkages with other societal sectors had been identified as a specific staff priority and responsibility" (Larson, 1988, p. 85-87, 92-94).

In the 1995 *Agreement to Re-Mandate* for TEN DAYS, the first stated objective was "to better engage local congregations and parishes in working for global justice" through "increased efforts to develop educational strategies and appropriate popular resources." A further objective is "to strengthen ecumenical local TEN DAYS groups" in part through training programs for volunteers.

Support from other Coalitions

Training and Support Resources are developed in collaboration with the network of inter-church coalitions which together make up the KAIROS ecumenical partnership. Materials are often *"borrowed"* and adapted to TEN DAYS constituencies. In Mary's view,

> *this interchange is extremely valuable because TEN DAYS could not compile the necessary materials without this collaboration. Cooperation with other inter-church coalitions in developing materials is very important: National staff develop materials based upon local and regional recommendations, but it's not all done from scratch. For example, with fair trade, a lot of the coffee information came through Transfair Canada. It's the same idea with networking and sweatshops. We take the appropriate material and put it into a format that suits our network and together we chose our actions.*

Here, Mary also mentioned consultations with global partners as being a source of support to educators, in choosing actions, because

> *that's where the international action component comes in. Debt cancellation for example: we decided that we could engage our networks in the issue and make it a very broad, big action campaign. Other times we'll say that we will work on something that is more focused.* (30 May 2000)

Ruth also emphasized the support and training effect which is inherent in the *"ongoing dialogue within the organization and between all segments of it, as well as with our international partners. It's critical"* (26 July 2000).

Denominational support and leadership training was mentioned as a further element in enabling TEN DAYS participants to be more effective in their global education activities but,

from the perspectives of these interview participants, it seems less important than the other activities and strategies such as annual regional training events, national support, and support from other coalitions. Here, the quality of the resource materials was rated very highly with the single qualification that local committee members are the ultimate resource, without whom nothing happens. Training--regional and national, two-way communications, national support intentionally aimed at strengthening local committees, countering centralizing tendencies, is all very important. Support from the other coalitions is also seen by participants as essential and mutually beneficial. TEN DAYS needs the information, knowledge and research support and the other coalitions, which are much more centralized, lack sensibilities regarding popular and participatory education; they need help from TEN DAYS to get their message out.

The training and support component depends on focused resources which have been designed to advance a global justice agenda and which is influenced at different levels by different forces. As TEN DAYS has strengthened the alliance with other socially transformative or antisystemic organizations as outlined above, and become more vocal regarding calls for reform to the G7/8-IFI-WTO complex of global governance and control, pressures from within the institutional church for more pro-systemic behavior on the part of TEN DAYS increased. Although the focused resources, the regional and national support, and support from the coalitions tend to move in the direction of participatory and democratic approaches to social concerns, the tensions and pressures exerted by the neoliberal globalisers inside and outside the churches tend to move the programme back to safer middle ground. At the moment it is difficult to assess the actual state of affairs; in the midst of change it is hard to see what comes next. This reinforces the need to adhere to the TEN DAYS guidelines for realistically analyzing the situation, the social reality, the "moment" and acting on that analysis as part of the reflection-action-reflection cycle of praxis. As evidence that the agenda of the neo-liberal globalisers is in ascendency, a recent CCIC (2002) position paper responding to CIDA's growing (ongoing) support for globalization from above states that many CCIC members have "grave concerns, reinforced . . . by informal messages from various parts of the Agency that CIDA no longer values nor places priority on renewing and expanding Canadian civil society contributions in Canada's aid programmes" (p. 1). CIDA has long been a source of financial support for the work of TEN DAYS. TEN DAYS / KAIROS and other churches and church-based organizations and coalitions are part of CCIC. This kind of forceful, direct language is only one indication of the serious differences which exist between certain segments of the Canadian state and an umbrella organization which represents most NGOs and CSOs in Canada

which have a development or global education orientation.

Youth Focus

The Youth Initiative is another strategy which is seen as growing in importance. It has arisen in recent years in response to the need to introduce young people to issues of development and global justice and to encourage participation in local TEN DAYS committees. The aging of active TEN DAYS participants and declining church membership means increased competition for fewer volunteers to do more work.

In Mary's opinion, and for others as well, there is
> *a real need to engage youth within and from outside the church constituency in issues of global justice and development. In some ways the youth initiative is being given a separate focus, looking at ways of doing education and action, engaging youth both in the churches and in the broader community, designing education and action materials, networking.* (30 May 2000)

Several interview participants observed that the interest in and emphasis on drama shows special promise in attracting and engaging youth. Reflecting the general view, Mary went on to say that
> *We have found drama to be especially effective. Young people learn about issues like FAIR TRADE by presenting the issue and by being involved in the drama. The sweatshop fashion show connected with what's very real to them, the whole idea of advertising, brand-name clothes. They begin to ask questions about where the labour comes from to make their favorite brand. The educational techniques of being involved in the drama include participation, reflection, and action.* (30 May 2000)

Mary further observed that
> *the initiative is evolutionary and part of the action-reflection model. Recognizing that most of our committees are older people, the youth initiative makes sense. An on-going question is whether or not young people need to be involved in local TEN DAYS committees. The reality is that young people's lives change very quickly and this has implications for involvement in local committees and programming.* (30 May 2000)

Age eighteen to twenty-four (more or less) is an eventful time in the lives of most people when decisions often are made which have life-long implications. Exposure to TEN DAYS issues at this stage is important as a counter-balance to the globalization-from-above views which dominate the media and other forms of mass culture and education. Exposure to the TEN DAYS orientation to development education in the denominations and the community, sensitizes people to alternatives to mainstream (modernization) paradigms of development and sources of information, support, solidarity.

Study participants also commented on the place of youth in the TEN DAYS program and efforts to bring youth on board. Ruth noted that, today,

> it has become part of the strategy. It was not allowed by the churches a few years ago. Our program was for adults, adult education, and we were not allowed to prepare Sunday school materials or youth resources. There were other parts of the church with that responsibility. In the last few years we have gotten permission from the churches to target youth, youth groups in the churches, university and high school students, and to provide resources for them. (26 July 2000)

One perspective of the focus on youth emphasizes the responsibility of TEN DAYS to expose youth and young adults to an important and relevant set of alternatives to the kinds of representations and analyses of global social concerns which are usually presented in the mainstream corporate media and in the formal education systems. Furthermore, for Ruth it is clear that

> youth are very much aware the world they're growing up in is a mess. They know they're facing a very poor job market; they can't imagine it's worse elsewhere, but to find that these things are structural and systemic instead of an individual problem is empowering for them and they have the energy and the desire at that age to make the world a better place. This is important, not primarily to replace the aging volunteers but because they're the ones that can see the vision of a better world and have the energy to pursue that vision. (26 July 2000)

Importance of Specific Program Materials

Within TEN DAYS there is a move toward more inclusiveness of youth and young adults in decision-making regarding programming as well as development of resource materials aimed at and for youth and young adults. To some extent, there has been increased direct youth involvement and participation at the local committee level related to educational techniques and reflection on issues and action. A limited number of recently-instituted CIDA-sponsored youth internships provide an opportunity to gain, and share, practical experience in Third World settings. Interns have worked for three-month periods in South Africa and Nicaragua and have subsequently been involved in Canadian tours aimed at engaging youth in TEN DAYS issues. An important part of the job of the interns has been to encourage the development of networks with others in the community and across Canada who are engaged in similar issues; working together, sharing resources, taking collective action. Possibilities include networking with church youth, university youth, girl guides, boy scouts and other groups that have social awareness as part of their mandate, and student chaplaincies or public interest groups such as Public Interest Research Groups.

The youth and young adult presence at the national gathering 2000 highlighted the fact that differing ideas and perceptions exist at various stages of life. As Rachel pointed out,

> I think their perceptions were very different from ours in a lot of ways. We did

> *time-line exercises and plugged people into where they fit and it was really interesting to hear the young people say that, 'no, this isn't how we perceive things at all', or, 'this wouldn't work for us because this isn't how our particular youth-political system works with our peers'.* (17 September 2000)

At this national gathering consideration was given to the need to orient youth to the TEN DAYS structure and their views were invited. Rachel again: *"The young people were asked for their input into planning the program materials and what would be suitable and what wouldn't, as well as visioning for the next three-year theme and the next year's program"* (17 September 2000).

The question was raised as to how global justice education can be made part of the curriculum in Alberta schools in order to reach youth early, where they begin to examine social issues, as well as at the senior high level where the issues are developed further. Currently, a key component of the TEN DAYS youth initiative is a focus on networking with university and college age youth who are involved with global justice work at the post-secondary level. There is some concentration on Sunday Schools, but more is needed. Local schools feel the need for resources, to engage their students in asking some of these questions. To do so, there is need for age-specific materials to be provided to the people who are going to use them, and this may involve educating the educators as well as the students. Ruth observed that

> *there was networking with the Alberta Teachers Association (ATA) during the time of the global education initiative. A TEN DAYS representative attended a recent ATA education event to raise the international education questions and provide input into some of the workshops, as a participant.* (26 July 2000)

Further regarding the formal education system, Ruth points outs that *"we've had workshops for teachers to highlight the issues and show them the resources we have available and how to use them in the classroom; then it's up to the teachers how they choose to use the materials"* (26 July 2000).

The TEN DAYS experience, generally, has been that adaptation for youth and young adults of program material primarily aimed at adults is not effective. Rachel says there should be

> *a differentiation between what is appropriate for adult denominational groups within a congregation to work with and a focused program for youth and young adults. Basic program material has to be very specific for their needs. They have different energy levels, different commitment levels, and most want to feel they have some ownership over what they're doing.* (17 September 2000)

Some participants raised further questions about effectiveness with regard to the youth initiative. As Mary pointed out, one level is providing relevant resources for their

involvement, *"the other level is working together with youth and deciding what issues we take on, how do we deal with them?"*

As did all interview participants, Mary raised other questions related to the overall program, including, of course, the youth and young adult element; questions about relations

> *with global partners, global development. How do we maintain contact and take on issues which are key and central to people in two thirds of the world? the South in the North, those people here in Canada that are experiencing those same situations? how do we design a program that engages and listens to the voices of the global partners, the poor in Canada, and many of our middle-class church people who are looking at involvement in development and global justice and what's our role and how do we connect and how do we listen? These are some of the learnings and the challenges of the program; some of the realities.* (30 May 2000)

A separate focus on youth within the structure of TEN DAYS accords with the view that popular and participatory education begins with people's everyday experience, encourages equitable participation and collective action for change through democratic practices, while engaging the whole person. In large part, this has been the approach which TEN DAYS has adopted.

To conclude this section on the strategies used to achieve core program goals and objectives, we have seen that there are four principal themes. First, the international action and solidarity strategy, focuses on the growing realization of interconnectedness and the effects of globalization. The high profile/Third World Visitor Program and networking and solidarity initiatives are important elements. The second theme, popular education includes the increased accessibility of program resources geared for people at different stages in their exposure to global education which make use of popular education techniques, a focus on specific issues and associated action possibilities. Education, action, and advocacy are integral aspects of this theme. Training and support for TEN DAYS global educators is the third theme in this category which encompasses resource materials, annual regional and provincial training events, support from the national level of TEN DAYS, and support from other interChurch coalitions. The fourth theme is the youth focus, a recognition that the program needs new members, and young people need direction or help in gaining a critical perspective on issues of global justice. Here, the importance of specific program materials, oriented toward an identifiable demographic segment of the Canadian population and the constituency of potential TEN DAYS supporters, is strongly emphasized.

Effectiveness of Global Education Strategies and ongoing Challenges

The question here, the effectiveness of strategies, relates to how well the educational strategies meet the needs of program participants by increasing their levels of critical awareness and improving their capacity to work with others in education for focused action. The evaluation strategies and indicators of program effectiveness have matured along with the program, the participants, and in concert with a growing critical appreciation of the complexities of issues and concerns related to development and global education. Some challenges facing TEN DAYS are ongoing, such as financial issues and matters of control, and depend on views of the purposes of the program as well as ways in which these purposes are to be achieved. Apathy, an aging constituency, and limited access to power brokers also pose long-term challenges, while others are of a more situational or temporary nature such as the restructuring of interChurch coalitions, media contacts, and representation of issues. Addressing these challenges is difficult and calls a global socio-economic and political analysis which both transcends the endless daily human struggle for survival and meaning in favor of Braudel's (1984) *longue durée* and yet recognizes that the real issue is "how the theology of the church supports or calls into question the political and social systems of which it is a part, particularly in reference to their effects on 'the least' of the human family" (Larson, 1988, p. 223), and does so on a moment-by-moment basis.

Effectiveness of Strategies

The overall strategy revolves around information and awareness, education and focused action. There was complete agreement on the part of interview participants that, as Mary said, *"focused education and actions have been most effective, where people are able to see a direct result from their efforts."* There also was recognition of the importance of better-focused resource materials with action suggestions or possibilities aimed or directed at different *"categories"* of people; alternative action strategies where it's easier for people to say, *"OK, I can see that, I can do that, I can be part of it."* Action alternatives need to reach people and speak to them where they are; action plans must meet individual and collective criteria of what is *"doable."* The "smorgasbord" approach is recommended as a means of meeting people where they are, at that point or moment (Barndt, 1989) where it seems feasible or realistic to take a particular action. Recognizing and seizing the "moment" demands concrete action suggestions, not vague possibilities. In Sarah's view, *"direct action-oriented resources seem to be more effective, something people can do now that's simple."* For example,

> in the last two years the youth have been involved in a fashion show, promoting the coffees and educational materials. There is a Just Christmas sale promotion in

and the youth have been there. This past year the youth at the university got involved and they were promoting fair-traded coffee and retail clothing sales at the university. They also helped us in our local ecumenical group. (26 June 2000)

The more focused and user-friendly resource materials have been a crucial part of the increased effectiveness of the TEN DAYS strategy. Paul mentioned that the effectiveness of the strategy can be seen with respect to the Canadian government stance on debt cancellation, the Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative, in which TEN DAYS was involved. Likewise, he spoke of the growing effectiveness of

getting the word out through Fair Trade Day, Fairly Traded coffee and other goods, Just Christmas Sale, posters and brochures there and at the Farmers' Market. Here in Edmonton we have a number of places that will sell Fairly Traded coffee in the cup. Starbucks in Canada and the US are now selling one variety of fairly-traded coffee, so we're getting the message out. But it's a slow process and people get discouraged at the committee level; we need to hear success stories, we need to have hope. (6 July 2000)

Ruth also pointed to instances where *"we have inspired or motivated some corporations to defend their business practices and also to make policy changes."* TEN DAYS participates in government inquiries or commissions regarding such issues as debt cancellation, ODA (official development assistance), IMF / World Bank, climate change, sweatshops, fair trade. TEN DAYS collaborates with other like-minded organizations on issues like the Jubilee Initiative and Fair Trade. Assessing the impact of TEN DAYS is difficult *"but the TEN DAYS publication Update is a very reliable source for tracking successes."* One indicator of success for Ruth:

When I first heard of TEN DAYS, in the early 1980s, it was through a poster put up at the back of the church and now there are very few congregations, in our church, who haven't heard of it and know something about the work of TEN DAYS. People may not participate, and they may not like it, but they know approximately what's happening. (26 July 2000)

Some participants responded to this question by saying that the strategies have been fairly successful, even very successful. As Rachel expressed it, *"our government is starting to listen in initiating a task force on sweatshop abuses because they were pushed and pressured by the people. Programs such as TEN DAYS alert people to these things"* (17 September 2000).

With regard to the importance and effectiveness of the visitor program, Rachel reported an incident which occurred when

a visitor was speaking about the garment industry program, the sweatshop campaign, in the high schools. As the kids were listening to this woman speak, I could see them all looking around at one another, looking at the clothes they were wearing. That's a very clear connection. Where she was talking about the

*conditions that the people work under making these clothes, these kids are all of a
sudden feeling themselves as part of this woman's life and problems. A lot of kids
were totally immersed in this woman's life, at that point, as they sat there in their
own clothes feeling her around them.* (17 September 2000)

From time-to-time, TEN DAYS strategies are perceived as being ineffective. However, the
time frame also needs to be taken into account. As Mary observed, the Jubilee Initiative or
Debt Campaign is an excellent example where short-term results were not apparent; only
over the longer-term is it possible to see the effects of the campaign:

*TEN DAYS started looking at the issue more than ten years ago; after three years
some committees asked to move on to something else, feeling that there was
nothing they could do. However, we can see what the people who kept going have
been able to achieve. There is a difference between taking on things where you can
see results and taking on things which are really difficult where you may not see
results for quite a long time. This relates to empowerment--going beyond actions
which are both engaging and achievable, the easy things, which are only the
surface. We need to be with community, with other people who are involved.* (30
May 2000)

Others agreed that an increased awareness of issues and the effectiveness of possible
responses or actions may only be evident over time. Rachel said,

*we may not see how effective they've been for years to come. If we talk about
engaging youth or animating the program for young people, we may not see the
effects of that for another half-generation, until these young people have grown and
evolved and are then the 'masses' that make up the voting blocs of people and
consumers.* (17 September 2000)

The importance of being prepared to seize the moment when it does arrive is recognized and
is part of

consciously trying to create a working relationship between development and
development education organizations and the community groups (social movements)
that will use the strengths of each sector to pursue long term, concrete objectives.
This will be a long, slow, and sometimes painful process. But we will . . . . consider
what our international perspective can bring to the issues, what are the parallel
activities in developing countries, and what strategies we can learn from these
activities. (Linds, 1991, p. 141)

Evaluation Strategies and Indicators

Before asking how well program goals and objectives are being met or achieved, the prior
question is always posed, to what extent do these goals and objectives continue to be
important, that is, of value to global society and relevant to those most in need. To
accomplish this, there are local, regional and national TEN DAYS structures which play a
role in program evaluation. The regions are: British Columbia, the Prairies (including
Western and Northern Ontario), Ontario, Quebec, and the Atlantic region. By way of
background information, the first level of consultation and program evaluation takes place at

the Annual Fall Regional Meetings when the
primary national staff interface with local committee participants takes place. Here, too, the upcoming programme is introduced, the action strategy anticipated, regional representatives and Annual Evaluation and Planning Meeting delegates elected, and Third World visitors chosen . . . . In summary, the regional structure of TEN DAYS, which began as a pragmatic and functional support for TEN DAYS programme implementation, has since 1984 become an important arena for local committee participation in TEN DAYS programmes. (Larson, 1988, pp. 106-108)

This local involvement of committee members at the regional level continues to the present and is considered to be vital to the health of the TEN DAYS network.

The second opportunity for consultation and evaluation occurs at the (formerly) Annual Planning and Evaluation Meeting, which now takes place every three years. This meeting began as "a consultation which has brought together local and / or regional committee representatives, ICCWDE members, and TEN DAYS staff for the purposes of evaluation of the programme, consultation for future planning, and networking." The first such meeting was in conjunction with a 1973 Canadian Council for International Cooperation-sponsored conference "to identify regional and Canadian trends in world development education, to examine other world development education models, and to strengthen relationships between the Development Education Animateur Project and other groups involved in world development education." Larson (1988) reports that there are three principal functions of this triennial meeting:

1. Evaluation, 'to reflect upon the TEN DAYS programme of the previous year, particularly from the perspective of local committees',

2. Consultation and Planning, which is only one, crucial, step in the planning process. 'The principle of the planning process for TEN DAYS has remained basically the same since 1974: the ICCWDE does preliminary thinking about and working towards the next year's programme. This information is fed into the annual meeting for reactions, comments, suggestions and prioritizing. Then, the ICCWDE works out the actual programme in the light of the discussions at the annual meeting'.

3. Networking. These annual meetings 'have changed in emphasis from consultative to participatory planning meetings . . . . By 1987, the Annual Evaluation and Planning Meeting had become a critically important aspect of the planning process for TEN DAYS'. (pp. 108-112)

Interview participants in this present study were strongly agreed that these two sets of meetings, regional and national, are central to maintaining and enhancing the quality and quantity of decision-making input from local committees which is subsequently "operationalized" by regional and national representatives working together.

Program evaluation must be seen within the context of an overall program focus, and the ways in which that focus is determined. Initially, the focus was part of the general, overall campaign to raise levels of awareness in Canadian church constituencies and in the broader Canadian public about Third World development issues. As Larson (1988) points out, the change from a national consultation meeting, where local and regional input was largely restricted to agreeing or disagreeing with a pre-determined theme, focus and action plan, to a participatory process where local input has at least an equal opportunity of being heard and recognized, has been pivotal in moving to the current style of decision-making about program focus and action plans. Today, as Ruth clearly states,

> *national policy is officially set by the board but it is not done outside what the local*
> *committees have said they think is the way it should go. This is a key thing about*
> *TEN DAYS: nobody ever feels they're being dumped on and if something comes*
> *out of national office that's new or different local committees say what they think*
> *about it. If feedback indicates it's not appropriate or not possible, it's dropped.*
> *Or if local responses are positive but suggest waiting until next year then that's*
> *what happens. If it's something where there are time constraints it's put out as an*
> *option, not as a requirement, so committees can choose whether to do it or not.*
> *The direction comes from the field, not from national office.* (26 July 2000)

The overall impression from comments and observations interview participants made regarding the evaluation process was that the structure of the national TEN DAYS network is like an inverted pyramid, where the grassroots, local committees are located at the top using the language of hierarchy and evaluation occurs at all levels. Decisions are made by national committee, with PLURA representatives, staff members and regional representatives and coordinators, based on input from local committees across the land. It is a consensus model, essentially governed and directed by feedback, suggestions, directions from the grassroots, i.e., the local committees. This feedback is channelled into the national committee where issues are prioritized, themes decided upon and programs developed. Then, these issues, themes and program initiatives are fed back to local committees for confirmation that they do reflect the intentions, directions identified earlier in the evaluations and recommendations which the regional representatives and coordinators carried to national committee. The very nature of the TEN DAYS structures, the networks, the organization recognizes that effective action at the local level will occur only if the members of local committees agree with the directions identified by national committee. Generally, the program and action strategies are shaped by local recognition of Canadian social realities as well as global realities (from Interviews, May-September 2000).

The National Planning and Evaluation meeting provides the opportunity for the National Committee, made up of representatives from the five sponsoring churches, the national staff,

and regional coordinators, to decide upon the issue(s), program and the three-year theme, based upon the on-going evaluations of the local committees which are brought forward by the regional representatives and tabled for discussion; looking for new directions, what worked, what didn't, local concerns from across the network. So that, as Rachel put it, regarding the *"evaluation strategies of TEN DAYS, we consult the network to see how well the program is going and what we can do better as an organization."* Mary went on to explain that it is at this meeting, every three years,

> *where regionally-elected representatives come together nationally to do an evaluation and some contextual analysis. What is a Canadian reality; what are some of the global realities; what are the issues; where should TEN DAYS focus? At the meeting there are processes for prioritizing, the information is then fed into the national committee where the final decisions are made in consultation with the funding churches and the other coalitions. It's a difficult process using a consensus model.*

Mary continued, saying that the consensus model of decision-making is demanding and time-consuming but it is precisely *"this difficult decision-making process which is part of what makes TEN DAYS unique"* (30 May 2000).

Ruth summarized the general description by study participants of the process over the past number of years where

> *every committee gets an evaluation form to fill out. It asks about the theme, each of the resources, the action options, the committee itself, international speakers, suggestions for follow-up and for next year's theme, resources, approach, strategies and criticisms. These are taken to a meeting in June attended by every regional representative. The resources and plans are not in place until after that meeting. The board is also asked for input and so it goes through all levels where representatives are asked in writing and verbally about future directions. I would say in the last ten years the program has been largely run by local committees. National policy is officially set by the board but it is not done outside what the local committees have said they think is the way it should go.* (26 July 2000)

A central part of evaluation involves reflection. Again, Ruth nicely summarized the process:

> *TEN DAYS uses the praxis model. The first action is recognizing a situation, finding resources to do education, which leads to theological reflection which again leads to action and in that there's also an evaluation process. Before moving on to the next year's activities or resources there is reflection on what has been done, how it was done, and how effective it was. We've always had a component in the evaluation that asks us to evaluate not only the impact that we have on the people in the program but also the impact on the volunteers who are implementing the program. Was this a program that nurtured? drained you? challenged sufficiently? too challenging? Decisions for next year's theme and programming are made by the people who were active in implementing and participating in last year's program. Their suggestions are what goes into the final decisions. So local committees make the decisions for next year's program. National office takes the suggestions, collates everything, puts them together and chooses between options if there are no clear guidelines, in conjunction with what*

they know about resources that are available. I think it's a very good application of the circle of praxis. (26 July 2000)

Perhaps the most important indicator of TEN DAYS programme success is the individual change reported by participants. There was consensus that, as Mary said,
> **it makes a difference to the individual who is involved in the process.** *As the individual becomes involved and takes action it changes who they are not only in the TEN DAYS network but changes who they are in how they live life, whether in their other form of professional work or how they raise their kids, how they vote, and so forth.* (30 May 2000)

Another example, reported in personal conversation outside the formal interview setting with TEN DAYS organizers, of the impact of TEN DAYS and the network of other Canadian peace and justice organizations have had at the governmental level relates to the Debt Cancellation - Jubilee Initiative. Officials in the Canadian Ministry of Finance are reported to have confided to organizers that the campaign was one of the most effective lobbying efforts they had seen.

Part of the annual evaluation forms for congregations and local ecumenical groups involves reporting numbers: people reached through events, discussion groups, brochures and posters, amount of coffee sold, letters sent to MPs and political leaders especially regarding debt cancellation. There are also accounts of meetings between church and government leaders; Sarah's view was that *"responses from the government side indicate that ideas from TEN DAYS are welcome and do have impact"* (26 June 2000). Other indicators which Ruth mentioned are included in the
> *annual written evaluations, locally, regionally, nationally. The staff do evaluations; every committee that does a public or congregational presentation is encouraged to get evaluative feedback from the participants of that particular event. We're asked subjective questions as well as objective questions about measurable results, impact and public response, media response.* (26 June 2000)

Paul added that, *"in reviewing the forms in our own local committees we have the opportunity to see whether it has been up to our expectations or not, and we recognize problems or successes we didn't expect"* (6 July 2000).

Another element, which is growing in importance, is consultation with global partners. Mary explained that
> *debt cancellation for example, is where the international action component comes in. We decided that we could engage our networks in the issue and make it a very broad, big action campaign. Other times we will work on something that is more focused. The international visitors also play an vital role in this consultation process and are asked to do an evaluation of the program, their participation, role and perceptions of the program overall,* (30 May 2000)

The results of the interviews with TEN DAYS participants confirm that directions outlined under the heading, "Evaluation and Participatory Planning," in the 1995 *Agreement to Re-mandate* have been implemented, in large part. As stated in the Agreement,

> TEN DAYS has over the years developed effective tools and processes for evaluation and consultative planning. TEN DAYS will seek to strengthen its evaluation and participatory planning in the following ways:
>
> • TEN DAYS National Committee will set clear, action-oriented and measurable goals for each year's program. TEN DAYS will annually conduct a survey of its local groups and subscribers. An attempt will be made to measure the impact of the program through analysis of the results of its surveys, assessment of media coverage and determining the effectiveness of its action campaigns.
>
> • TEN DAYS will continue to hold an Annual Evaluation and Planning Meeting which will bring representatives from local TEN DAYS groups from each region together to evaluate past TEN DAYS programs and make recommendations for future programming. TEN DAYS will also seek input for program planning from its Third World partners, sponsoring churches, local TEN DAYS groups and ecumenical coalitions and Canadian social movement groups. (p. 5)

More recently, researchers Gail Allan and Ted Reeve[4] reported that

> TEN DAYS has been highly successful during this past mandate in increasing public awareness of global social and economic justice issues. Its public campaigns have been increasingly accessible by large numbers of people and have given church and community people tangible ways to express their desire for justice. (4 May 2000)

They noted some new trends in understanding the citizen-consumer tension in the context of global citizens' movements and eco-justice, as well as the need for greater levels of participation at all levels, particularly youth. Multi-media communication is another area for on-going work.

Reeve & Allan concluded that the profile of TEN DAYS members and subscribers "represents the mainstream demographic profile of the churches" and they "are highly committed Christians working for social justice," however, "the obvious homogeneity of TEN DAYS raises the question of whether the organization will commit time and money to changing its profile?" They found that the overall program direction "affirms eco-justice, global equity, democracy, and methods of redistribution." In terms of organizational challenges,

- there remains a strong commitment to TEN DAYS and its work;
- resources are appreciated and used in a variety of settings;

---

[4] Centre for Research in Religion, Emmanuel College of Victoria University and the Toronto School of Theology in the University of Toronto.

- there is an interest in strengthening research and theological reflection capacity;
- financing: an openness to new options;
- high priority given to youth work; and
- interest in inter-cultural / religious developments.

Their assessment, or "big opinion," is that
- the survey has affirmed the mandate and direction of TEN DAYS;
- it has not penetrated youth/inter-cultural interest;
- the mandate and interest to expand into this area exists but needs leadership and money to develop; and
- new media methods are an obvious area for development.

As we see, the findings from Reeve & Allan (2000) are consistent with those of the research conducted for this present study. The consultation process which prioritizes local input and control was itself arrived at though a long and difficult consultation process and needs to be preserved. The evident sense of program ownership is part of a process that reflects the views of people along the line, especially those at the community level; a clear reversal of the traditional hierarchical approach to decision-making. The importance of the predominant decision-making model must be acknowledged, both from the perspective of TEN DAYS participants who expressed their strong approval and support for it, and from the perspective of those outside the program who may be somewhat less enthusiastic about this independence from more traditional controls. Other decision-makers, differently located and with different interests may hold different views. Nevertheless, as Ruth said, voicing the general consensus of the interview participants,

> I think TEN DAYS is effective because it doesn't fall into a patriarchal model, a hierarchical model, and it's grassroots driven. When people are getting orders from a head office, even in the form of information, they begin to feel like they're being used and that leads to disinterest and burnout. Whereas in TEN DAYS people have so much decision-making power, so much participation in the decision-making that they're doing their own thing, not someone else's. I think that's a strength of the program. (26 July 2000)

Independent confirmation of the success of TEN DAYS in global education regarding social and economic justice issues in Canada suggests the overall TEN DAYS approach will be used as a model in future global, popular and development education initiatives. For example, the ACGC *G7/8 Popular Education Workshop* is based on a model similar to the one which worked so well for the generation of popular educators of which TEN DAYS was part.

Challenges
Some challenges to and for TEN DAYS are ongoing, such as financial and issues of control, and depend on views of the purposes of the program as well as ways in which these

purposes are to be achieved. Additional challenges include apathy, an aging constituency, limited access to power brokers, and establishing and maintaining media contacts while offering alternative ways of representing issues of development and global education.

Control and Direction

Generally, challenges have been in relation to the direction and control of the program and have come both from within TEN DAYS and from without; struggles between the "priestly globalizers" and the "prophetic reformers / transformers," wherever they are located. As Larson's (1988) study indicated, there were struggles within TEN DAYS between local committees and the national committee of the ICCWDE for control of program direction. By 1981 regional representation at the national level had been formalized and from 1984 there was the continuing emergence of "a commitment to the participation of people at all levels of TEN DAYS in the decision-making process" (p. 100).

Today, challenges include continued tension regarding central versus local control of program direction. The centralizing tendency is reflected in the agendas of the participating churches and the composition of the national committee. Rachel discovered that it is necessary to

> *deal with the agendas of the involved churches, to be aware of what they are willing and not willing to allow as direction in the program. There's a real imbalance on the national committee of representation from the denominations and from the network of committees themselves. Part of the problem is members of the national committee have to wear different hats: their personal hat, their staff or denominational hat, their local committee hat, and their denominational hat outside of the staff position. There are only four people around that table making the decisions who are representatives of the regional network; it tends to overbalance those things and it's been difficult to maintain a strong voice from the regions within that context.* (17 September 2000)

Furthermore, on the basis of the interviews, there is recognition of the tension, creative or otherwise, between the "prophetic" nature of TEN DAYS and the requirements of the "priestly" church. The tension, which might be conceptualized as "systemic" and "antisystemic," is between order and change, between the evident realistic, pragmatic need and responsibility to engage the people of the member churches (a long, slow process) and the increasingly urgent need to be prophetic, to challenge and disturb people. Mary was clear in her view that *"TEN DAYS is prophetic, it is on the edge."* However, and perhaps for this reason, resistance to TEN DAYS-type education and programming is common in theological colleges and churches across Canada. Mary went on to say,

> *If TEN DAYS had to meet all the requirements of all the churches and be mainstream, it couldn't do some of the things that it does. There is this challenge: let's engage the people of the churches but then you move more slowly; there's less*

ability to be prophetic. There's kind of a balance. But this is part of what's coming up with restructuring. Part of the challenge is that if you change TEN DAYS to conform to the tradition of mainline churches, can it still be visionary and prophetic? Some people feel TEN DAYS is too political as it is.

Regarding the role of the church in society and where TEN DAYS fit into that? The coalitions are part of the prophetic and visionary role of the church. There's a whole spectrum of understanding to saying that the church has a role to be part of and on the side of the poor and the oppressed and to be of the poor and the oppressed. The question is, does a small group of people try to change the way the whole church thinks or take action on their convictions, and in taking action be a witness and engage whoever wants to be engaged and challenge the church? The church itself is one of the structures which needs to be challenged. It is constantly in need of reform. So we don't stop acting but we are always engaged in the challenge and the questions of what's our vision and what's our role. It would be very sad, if in this restructuring, coalitions are made so much part of the mainstream that they can't be prophetic and visionary.

So, yes, we want to get the clergy on board but not so that it becomes so much the focus that we don't do these other things. (30 May 2000)

Inducing feelings of discomfort, challenging congregations to recognize and acknowledge the kinds of actions to which TEN DAYS participants feel they are called, developing a critical consciousness, is not conducive to mass support for TEN DAYS-like programs. Ruth contends that *"what TEN DAYS teaches is counter-culture"* and being ignored for that reason, alone, is part of the reality:

It's easier to teach something that affirms who a person is and how they are behaving than it is to teach them something that challenges them. What we're teaching is social reform; theological reform. The common view is that we're supposed to be individuals, independent, and look after ourselves and get the best bang for our buck. What TEN DAYS is telling us is that we're inter-connected, that people depend on us and we depend on them. What we do and say here has an impact around the world, sometimes (often) a negative impact. If we want to do unto others as we would have them do unto us it will cost us more. More money for commodities we buy every day because the biggest bang for the buck is starving people out. Our pension company investments are in places where the profits we're earning on our pensions are costing other people their lives. That's not right - theologically, morally, and if we don't know about it we don't have to worry about it. But when we know about it, then it's a problem for us. (26 July 2000)

The prophetic and visionary nature of TEN DAYS raises the question of whether, as "vanguard movement," it is possible or advisable to expend a great deal of energy in consciously trying to change the Church, or does TEN DAYS move ahead on issues of concern and encourage the Church to "catch up" as best it can, in its own good time? Interview participants agreed that TEN DAYS tries to do both. Sarah observed that *"The basic influence of the theological rational carries over into the rest of your social justice work. It's all part and parcel of the whole picture"* (26 June 2000). However, there was

also consensus that clergy, and others who may not be supportive of TEN DAYS, cannot be allowed to impede the progress of the programme. TEN DAYS participants feel strongly that this work is central to the role of the Church and constitutes *mission,* both institutionally and personally. For some PLURA church members, who traditionally have not had a well-developed mission program, TEN DAYS is seen as a "mission field." Paul's view is that

> *Some churches don't have much of a mission field these days, or never really had a particular one, so TEN DAYS is a substitute for that, to a certain extent. That's why some churches have more people involved in TEN DAYS. Whereas other churches outside of the PLURA, who might even have people on the committees, have their own mission committees and they're doing their own development work through their former missions. Some denominations don't have that so they work through TEN DAYS.* (6 July 2000)

Another internal challenge which relates to the prophetic-priestly nature of the Church is that TEN DAYS is a fringe movement or organization conceived and nurtured by prophetic elements within the institutional, priestly churches. Several interview participants had similar observations and, as Rachel said,

> *there are often two layers of agendas that need to be addressed. The churches which put money into the program attach some strings to this support. For example, 'these are our policies and these are the things that we want to do and this is how we can (or cannot) do them'. This is very evident in the constant struggle to get more of the people in the pews involved and, for those of us sitting around the table are the fringe people in the pews unless we're paid staff and it's part of the job description. Often the people who sit on the committees go again and again and give their spiel about TEN DAYS and getting involved, thinking that as church members people should be horrified that everybody in the congregation wasn't jumping up saying, 'we need to do something about this situation'. That should be one of the primary mandates of the churches,* (17 September 2000)

The overall lack of involvement of church members in TEN DAYS serves to illustrate the tension between the "prophetic" and the "priestly" church. There is this sense of "horror" amongst some TEN DAYS participants and committee members that many other members of the PLURA churches tend not to support the kinds of issues and concerns which TEN DAYS seeks to address. Too often, the only church members who do support the work of TEN DAYS, other than the active, volunteer committee members, are paid staff (there are three of these in Canada) and some clergy. Therefore, in Rachel's view, although the priestly priorities take precedence over the prophetic, under the circumstances, and

> *especially given the source of TEN DAYS funding as an ecumenical, a church-based program, there should be more pressure on the churches to include more of our program materials in that structure. However, the churches often seem to have a great deal more 'housekeeping' to do than focusing on the work of their social justice arms. It's not high on the list of priorities to keep social justice issues in front of the people* (17 September 2000).

Hence, this issue is of great concern to TEN DAYS supporters who, "prophetic" though they may be, are sufficiently realistic to recognize the dominance of the "priestly" church in the restructuring process, and to have some apprehensions about the future of TEN DAYS as it is presently constituted. In addition to restructuring, some of the challenges confronting TEN DAYS are financial, a general lack of church-based interest and involvement in the concerns addressed by the program, and an aging constituency infrastructure.

The general nature of the obstacles or challenges is related to the tensions between the priestly and the prophetic, systemic and antisystemic, neo-liberal globalization and globalization- or development-from-below, central control or local, democratic decision-making, elite interest or popular interest. None of these dichotomies is as clear as this may sound but there is a spectrum of positions which reflect the views of various participants involved in TEN DAYS. Available evidence indicates that the priestly, or status quo, approach to issues of global justice is supportable by those who benefit (or hope to do so) from the current configuration of global governance and economic control. Those who do not benefit, but without whom the system cannot continue, and who objectively should be on the prophetic, transformative side of the spectrum, often are convinced that there really is no alternative to the present unjust world order. That is a challenge for TEN DAYS.

Evidence from various sources indicates that qualitative changes have occurred in the capitalist world economy as the long post-WWII boom ended in the early 1970s and the long decline began. However, the inevitability argument advanced by advocates of globalization from above is rejected by critical analysts who observe that globalization "is a necessary myth because it provokes a sense of political paralysis among those who might otherwise imagine alternatives to an unstable world economy dominated by currency speculators and transnational capital" (Swift, 1999, p. 62).

Funding and Restructuring

Funding and restructuring issues constitute a significant and immediate concern among participants. As Ruth puts it,

> *all the churches are running into financial problems and they can't manage all these coalitions, so there is talk about whether they can all survive or all will be cut back or whether some or all will be closed down.* (26 July 2000)

Already, the effect of funding cuts to the visitor program have been detrimental to the overall effectiveness of TEN DAYS. The lack of funding has also resulted in a reduction in

program resources. Paul asked,

> *how will we be able to publish our materials if we're not getting the money? In fact, our annual evaluation and planning meetings have been cut to meetings every three years. Yet, unless we have these meetings where we can get in touch with people from all over the country? It's difficult to get the feedback and ideas about things that work, things that don't work, and the comradeship necessary to keep the work going.* (6 July 2000)

Also with respect to the restructuring issue, Rachel noted that the most recent consultant's recommendation conceptualizes

> *the TEN DAYS network more as a delivery vehicle than a resource for input and direction. There's a real danger of losing the energy and enthusiasm that we've built amongst the grassroots because we're not providing a mechanism for input any more. There is recognition that the network should be maintained but there is no provision for representation on the restructured board. No one is designated as board member to bring the regional voice to the table where the decisions are being made.* (17 September 2000)

There is further concern about the specific roles of the various InterChurch coalitions under restructuring. Mary explained that, at present,

> *some of them have a research and advocacy mandate, where they lobby government, corporations; this is a very small group of people. The TEN DAYS mandate, on the other hand, is to engage local grassroots people in the education and in the action. There is also a difference in the decision-making between these types of coalitions. With TEN DAYS, local people are part of the decision-making process, not just the disseminating process. These are some of the learnings we want to bring to the restructuring process. There has to be research, there has to be advocacy but there has been wonderful impact and learning and changes for individuals plus structures when you have a network which is involved in the process.* (30 May 2000)

Initially, and until early 2001, financial support for TEN DAYS was provided jointly between the sponsoring churches and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The breakdown of funding sources for TEN DAYS in 1999 showed CIDA providing 42% overall, 38% from the member churches, sales accounting for 10%, donations 6% and other 4% (TEN DAYS for Global Justice Review--Program Years 1995/96 - 1998/99, in Reeve & Allan, 2000).

The current arrangement has worked, even as TEN DAYS "has raised questions about the appropriateness of such a relationship." Certain contradictions are inevitable in the nature of church/state collaboration on program funding which is used by the churches to critique the very state policy upon which the funding is contingent (Larson, 1988, p. 112-113).

Interview participants agreed there are limits to how far TEN DAYS can go with existing funding and sponsorship. Recent concerns about continued funding arise, in part, from a

plethora of unresolved and pending law-suits regarding the residential school system in Canada. Some of the mainline churches, the basic funders of TEN DAYS, face serious financial difficulties with current residential school litigations. The Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and United Churches are engaged in negotiations with the Federal government to apportion blame and avoid ruinous liability.

To a certain extent, these particular difficulties are temporary but the lack of funding for TEN DAYS and other justice-oriented programming is permanent. The important point is that the shortage of financial support is a given, only the reasons for it vary. This clearly reflects the degree to which social justice concerns are seen as being either central or peripheral to the role of the Church. Interview participants agreed that sponsorship and support goes beyond funding. Paul observed that

> *Sponsorship generally is the funding and if the sponsors don't see it as of value then we have a problem. If they don't want to sponsor the program, they won't fund it. But it's more than just the funding, because a sponsor can promote something without necessarily funding it. Or they can just ignore it on the other hand, they might say its not important, the opposite of supporting it.* (6 July 2000)

Study participants agreed that funding is always precarious and a broad base of support is important. Ruth observed that the accountability required by funding bodies forces TEN DAYS

> *to have nameable and measurable results, which can be counterproductive, but if you set your goals and objectives well then that should be part of your evaluation process. It also means that you need to have solid grass roots support. It's really helpful if your grassroots support has a connection to a church or another organization which sponsors the work of TEN DAYS as well as a foot in the corporate and/or government sector.* (26 July 2000)

The external challenges to TEN DAYS relate to funding. Finances are a problem, from whatever source. Dependency on CIDA is particularly problematic, especially given that a critique of Canadian government institutions is one the fundamental roles of TEN DAYS. Further, the ephemeral nature of this source of funding is well known. It will be interesting in further research to explore how these reservations are addressed under the new KAIROS arrangements.

Here, at the point of financial support and program sponsorship, the limits and tensions between the priestly and the prophetic church, centre-periphery, systemic versus anti-systemic forces are most evident. On the one hand, agreement-in-principle with the carefully crafted theological arguments showing the scriptural evidence of necessity for the social and economic justice initiatives (that these are mandatory, not optional) is to be

expected. As study participants pointed out, over and again, there can be no argument from any quarter as to the "correctness" of the overall goals, purposes, objectives of TEN DAYS. Yet, on the other hand, there is the difficulty that neither the decision-makers (funders) nor those groups, individuals, and organizations in a position to influence decisions seem convinced that realizing their own self-interest lies in that direction. Although the objective conditions of the oppression of the majority of the world's people, and the planet itself, are obvious, and that this cannot continue, for reasons of ecological limitations as well as the inherent contradictions of the capitalist world system, it is not yet widely recognized that the "way out" of the dilemma is, finally, an ethical issue. As Freire said, shortly before his death,

> I know full well how difficult it is to put in practice a policy of development that would put men and women before profit. However, I believe that if we are going to overcome the crises that at present assail us, we must return to ethics. I do not see any other alternative. If it is impossible to have development without profit, then profit of its own accord cannot be the sole object of development in such a way that it justifies and sanctifies the immoral gain of the investor.[5] (Freire, 1998: 117)

The ideology of neo-liberal globalism having reached into every corner of the world, churches being no exception, these words have special significance here. Likewise, to the extent that many organizations and individuals are "investors" seeking profit there may be need for reflection.

Issues of credibility and legitimacy at the highest levels in some of the institutional churches are having a negative impact on funding from grassroots supporters. Add to this the elite view, in church, government and corporate circles, that TEN DAYS is a hindrance to the agenda of globalization-from-above and we the forces for change (restructuring) are the forces of reaction, cast as progressive, who can use the funding crisis resulting from historic abuses on the part of the priestly church as an excuse to cut the legs out from under the prophetic side, the mission side of the church.

Apathy

There was overall agreement that apathy is a major problem. From Ruth's point of view, *"there is always apathy."* It is unavoidable when the goal of an organization is social

---

[5] This is in keeping with Wallerstein's (1974b: 67) clarification of some reasons for "the limited possibilities of transformation within the capitalist world-economy" and the need to examine "the structure of the world-economy, its cyclical patterns . . . and the ways in which the position of particular states may change within this structure." The magician's trick of making money out of nothing through interest becomes clearer when the concept of unequal exchange is understood to be "*necessary* for the expansion of a world market if the primary consideration is *profit.* Without *unequal* exchange, it would not be profitable to maintain a capitalist world-economy" (71).

change; some people are bound to disagree with, and ignore, the premise that change (of any kind) is necessary. Sarah mentioned the link with the cult of the individual, pointing to

> *apathy, the current political situation as far as individualism is concerned, and the notion that we can all pull ourselves up by our bootstraps, as hindrances to understanding the global picture; that we're all here together and we are responsible for each other.* (26 June 2000)

Apathy, individualism and isolation stand in the way of positive social change. These are concerns both within the structures which are ostensibly supportive of TEN DAYS and in society at large. Contradictions abound and, as Rachel pointed out,

> *obstacles to making the connections will continue. The more globalized the world gets the more isolated we are within our own lifestyles; in the face of globalization the problem is getting it back to individual connections with people, because that's the picture we're trying to help people to see. We as human beings are all connected, affecting one another with the choices we make.* (17 September 2000)

For Paul, *"apathy in the churches is the biggest problem."* He further observed that, in order to counteract this,

> *what we really need is more hope and more enthusiasm in our meetings; they could be more 'fun'. Where the meetings are a social time, not just a situation where we have to go to this meeting as a duty or an obligation, not just working on the TEN DAYS project which comes in January or February but looking at more of a year-round program.* (6 July 2000)

Rachel saw this apathy in terms of what is often referred to as a "lack of political will." In her view, this means that

> *the economic structures that we've created globally, that is, the objectives of the global economy, insofar as the political agenda is concerned, are not served well by seeing development happen in Third World nations in particular and even amongst sections of our own society. It's more profitable to keep things going the way they are rather than putting programs in place to change them. Until those issues are addressed, the political wheels are not being greased, the corporate agenda is not being adhered to, and things will remain the same* [the objectives of neo-liberal globalism conflict with those of development, as defined here]. (17 September 2000)

Rachel also understood apathy to be, in part, a result of societal ignorance. There is a general lack of

> *awareness about the situations or structures that TEN DAYS looks to challenge and change. Without information people aren't urged or challenged to jump up and say, 'this is not right'. They're not encouraged to seek out more information. We just go merrily along doing whatever, and most of the people I talk to are completely unaware of the issues. We seem so cocooned in our developed world here that we are confused about what's going on in the rest of the world. We just naturally assume somehow that as we carry on our lives here that everything is the same somewhere else, to one degree or another. Even seeing the images on television, we seem so separate from it that we tend to just disregard it.*

> *I think that what TEN DAYS really tries to get to is raising awareness, that this is*

the way it really is out there in the world and this is why it can't continue. Without that information and education people are not motivated to do anything about it, and even some of them with that education are not motivated. (17 September 2000)

Apathy, then, seems to be the result of a certain "brutalization" of public sensibilities regarding the issues and concerns which global education seeks to address. There is a sense that these things really don't matter or they are not our concern, and/or there's nothing anyone can do about it anyway. There is a paralyzing combination of actual indifference and perceived impotence in the face of the all-powerful, impersonal forces of globalization, the current phase in the expansion of global capitalism. In this view of the nature of the world, at least the human dimension of it, endless expansion and limitless accumulation is the imperative or "logic" of globalization.

Clearly, there are limits to growth. To the extent that "sustainable" development is predicated upon a growth model of economic and human development, it too is unsustainable. For some of those to whom TEN DAYS and like-minded organizations are reaching out, apathy consists of varying degrees of indifference, on the part of those who are not directly affected, and perceptions of helplessness on the part of those who would work for change but see no alternative in the face of these apparent absurdities.

Another view is that these "absurdities" are some of the contradictions Freire (1998) pointed to which are inherent in the structure of the capitalist (neo-liberal) world economy. As he said,

> It is important to always bear in mind that the role of the dominant ideology is to inculcate in the oppressed a sense of blame and culpability about their situation of oppression . . . . [to ensure that] the wounded and marginalized [do not understand] the cause of their suffering is the perversity of the socio-political and economic system under which they live. As long as they think like this, they simply reinforce the power of this system. In fact, they connive, unconsciously, with a dehumanizing socio-political order. (p. 78)

From this perspective, true reform of the capitalist system is impossible because it can only exist as long as (increasing) inequalities exist; there is no possibility of a "kinder, gentler" capitalist system. An important part of an on-going global education, through TEN DAYS or otherwise, is to build on the rapidly-growing awareness that problems of concern are both global and local in nature, that they are everyone's problem, and to dispel the unrealistic and unhelpful delusions of powerlessness. If the majority of the world's people believe themselves to be unable to change local-global social conditions, and as a consequence do nothing, the benefits flow to the globalizers from above. On the other hand,

people who are part of globalization from below, who are part of the "array of transnational social forces animated by environmental concerns, human rights, hostility to patriarchy, and a vision of human community based on the unity of diverse cultures seeking an end to poverty, oppression, humiliation, and collective violence" (Falk, 1993, p. 39), recognize that resistance is both useful and indispensible.

Genuine indifference or disdain for the well-being of others and / or a perception of helplessness lead to this condition of apathy which was identified consistently as probably the most important challenge to the work of TEN DAYS. However, indifference is not necessarily tied to a sense of helplessness and futility, any more than perceived powerlessness is a necessary concomitant of lack of concern. In the context of this study, the focus is on (1) those who *are* concerned but who lack the tools to do anything constructive yet who are still searching for ways to make changes, and (2) those who *are* also concerned but who have abandoned the struggle as pointless and debilitating. There is a third category of people, for whom the concerns and issues related to vast and growing global inequalities are "functional." This category consists of those who are not indifferent to the conditions which cause suffering to other life forms on this planet but who approve of the situation and who may in fact be working to ensure its continuation. More accurately, perhaps, this is a category of people who understand clearly that their positions of privilege depend on the misery of others and will use all means necessary to ensure its continuation. An uncomfortable reality is to the extent that the high material living standards of most, if not all, people living in the North countries do depend on the maldevelopment and mass misery of most of the rest of the world's population, to that extent, most of us find ourselves, by default if for no other conscious reason, in Category Three (Reimer, et al., 1993, pp. 9-10).

A considerable part of the apparent apathy detected by TEN DAYS participants may be a result of confusion partly due to corruption of language where concepts are decontextualized and meaning is reversed. A current illustration involves the term "Economic Reform" which has

> nothing in common with its traditional usage and common-sense meaning--
> redistribution of income, increase of public welfare. The concept now refers to the
> reconcentration of income, upward and outward; the transfer of public property to
> private monopolies; and the reallocation of state expenditures from social welfare for
> workers and small farmers to export subsidies for giant corporations. (Petras, &
> Veltmeyer, 2001, p. 61)

It is one element of the move "to appropriate an anti-globalist, anti-corporate rhetoric for its

anti-egalitarianism" which is characteristic of some segments of the globalizers-from-above (Brecher, et al., 2000, p. 98).

Turning to the specific concern of clergy apathy and hostility to the work of TEN DAYS, there were two views on the issue. Paul noted that

> *there is also a lot of apathy because some churches can't seem to come up with a representative. In fact, there are some places where even the minister is not interested. If you can't get the ministers interested you can't really get much of a program in the church. There is a definite need for a more participatory role on the part of the clergy* (6 July 2000).

At the same time, as mentioned earlier, Mary took the position that, "*yes, we want to get the clergy on board but not if it becomes so much the focus [of our energies and resources] that we don't do these other things*" (30 May 2000). There is the constant need to prioritize: let those with ears and eyes hear and see; others may never hear or see or they may come along more slowly.[6] In any case, limited resources make it necessary to focus in areas where some results can reasonably be expected and the professional clergy is not, generally speaking, seen to be one of those areas. Possible reasons, causes, explanations for this situation, both the perceptions and the reality, could be the focus of a future study.

For present purposes, apathy and opposition to TEN DAYS-like initiatives may be seen as indications of support for the dominant or mainstream views of social reality which tend to preserve the positions of privilege of socio-economic elites, rather than determined opposition to the goals and objectives of these programs. The "good" discourse of those who support change and transformation in favour of the disadvantaged, dispossessed, marginalized, and enslaved segments of human society is fine and uplifting but ultimately dismissed as "unrealistic," the final judgment ending further discussion.

Other Barriers and Challenges

Ruth identified a variety of challenges:

> *the aging of committed TEN DAYS volunteers; the apathy, the indifference of governments, of corporations to policy that doesn't necessarily promote themselves, or that will cut back on profits (there has to be some limit on profits); public behaviour and attitudes; access to decision-makers and our credibility with them is an ongoing concern.*

Another challenge Ruth pointed to is corporate media presentations of global social justice issues which are distorted and misleading. As she said,

> *if we had television programs and movies from the Third World, we would have a*

---

[6] See, for example, Mt 13.13,14; Rom 11.8; Isa 29.10; Deut 29.4.

better window on who they are and how they live. There is too much one-way communication and it's only alternative sources coming to us. So that's really an obstacle. TV, radio, and movie information flow from the Third World to the Western world is insufficient, almost non-existent. Now we're getting e-mail communication from the Third World and from Eastern Bloc countries, and that's made quite a difference to the North American perception of what's going on on the other side of the world. (26 July 2000)

Aging, media bias, and unequal access to power brokers are obstacles or challenges common to social movements worldwide. It is important to bear in mind that what social movements lack in terms of access to financial resources and economic power, they more than compensate for in access to huge numbers of global citizens whose consent is vital to maintaining existing configurations of "corporations, markets, governments, international institutions, and the rules governing them" (Brecher, et al., 2000, p. 110).

Overcoming Challenges

How has TEN DAYS gone about overcoming these challenges? In the case of internal challenges, the fundamental response is theological clarity on issues which TEN DAYS addresses. The sense among interview participants was that the theological rationale for this work is so clear and unambiguous, having been thoroughly vetted by the sponsoring churches, that the only response for those opposed to TEN DAYS is to actively ignore it. Opposition arises for reasons other than theological, hence the most effective strategy for those who disagree with 10 Day is to ignore it, to marginalize it, to exclude it from the mainstream activities of the church. The outcome of any serious debate of the issues, from a theological perspective, would be a foregone conclusion. Ruth explained that because there are

> *implications for funding from church and other organizations which may not agree with the overall direction of TEN DAYS programming, we are always very careful to keep the program theologically sound. Theological reflection is vetted through all five mainline churches before it's published in the resources; nobody can say this is not the theology in our particular church. The approach which is taken is always theologically-based. There are going to be theological disagreements about the TEN DAYS approach, but we try to make sure that it's very difficult for 'opponents' to have any real theological basis for their opposition. It is always a challenge not to compromise one's values and the quality of the work in order to secure the funding.* (26 July 2000)

As Sarah put it,
> *going back to the theological rationale for doing global justice, my favourite is Micah 6[7] where to act justly and walk humbly and love our God is the focal point*

---

[7] Micah 6:8: ". . . what does the LORD require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?"

for those people who have faith and if we can help people to see that living that faith out is where we get the help we need. Obstacles such as wars, conflict, materialism, militarism, seem insurmountable but somehow we keep working at it, hoping. (26 June 2000)

So this is the great strength of TEN DAYS: the faith-based nature of the organization. Biblically-inspired and supported notions of justice continuously motivate small but important numbers of people from the sponsoring churches, and from other backgrounds as well, to become involved in initiatives like TEN DAYS. As Paul explained,

generally, the groups are made up of representatives from churches. This is the way a lot of people become involved in TEN DAYS; the church will have an outreach committee and part of the function of the committee is to attend these 10 Days meetings. People are on these committees in the first place because they have some interest in the issues....[and they] do take their work seriously. (6 July 2000)

The point here is the need to keep the scriptural basis of the work at the forefront; chipping away at the institutional armour which has built up over the centuries and prevents people from seeing and understanding that the real work of the Church is to keep the vital impulse toward justice alive. For Mary, the faith-based nature of TEN DAYS is crucial to the organization's "survivability." Networking is a central ingredient, as is moving toward an inter-faith orientation:

It is a strength, this ability for TEN DAYS to involve a spiritual component. For example, teaching social justice issues in a school setting is different from talking about social justice issues in an ecumenical organization. There can be a spiritual component as part of it. An ability to pray together, to look at scripture as a common element; that people come together from that basis. It provides support and hope for people who are involved in the challenges and the struggles. (30 May 2000)

In her study, Larson (1988) conducted a content analysis of the programme resources of TEN DAYS, from its inception, in order "to reveal regularities or patterns to inform the analysis of TEN DAYS in particular, and the nature of development education in general." There appeared to be seven conceptually distinct thematic units in the resource material:

1. Consciousness Raising;
2. Empowerment, defined as a process of moving from consciousness to political or strategic action (Hall, 1983, p. 112, in Larson, 1988, p. 194);
3. Canadian / Third World Parallels;
4. Building Coalitions;
5. Influencing Policy;
6. Biblical Basis for Justice; and
7. TEN DAYS Theme Interpretation, "information about TEN DAYS, its programme, function and sponsors" (Larson, 1988, pp. 192-197).

The centrality to TEN DAYS of the Biblical basis for Justice is evident in this present study. There is agreement by participants about the importance of

information which establishes a biblical and/or theological rationale for justice and

Christian involvement in issues of justice . . . . information which deals with the spiritual dimension of a commitment to justice . . . . [and] information about the role of the church in issues related to development and justice (Larson, 1988, p. 197).

However, it is also noted that while TEN DAYS "clearly reflects the Christian emphasis of the programme . . . this emphasis is consistently concretized in relation to a specific social analysis" (p. 216). This speaks to the persistent question of the "political neutrality" of the church and the "ideological orientation" implicit in social justice activities, as well as the degree to which any position can be said to be "theologically sound." One view is that

> there is no theological unanimity within any of the churches which are members of TEN DAYS, and so the claim that TEN DAYS is or is not an expression of the theology of a given member church depends in part on who makes this judgment . . . . The fact that theology is contextual results in differing theological appraisals of and attitudes toward TEN DAYS within the churches . . . . Therefore, the important theological issue raised by TEN DAYS is not that of the churches' political involvement. Rather, it is the question of how the theology of the church supports or calls into question the political and social systems of which it is a part, particularly in reference to their effects on 'the least' of the human family. (p. 223)

How is the call to social and spiritual responsibility understood and practiced? As the interview participants indicated, some of the important challenges TEN DAYS has encountered in meeting its goals and objectives include those which are (1) internal to the program itself, (2) external to the program but within the framework or context of the sponsoring churches, and (3) external to both, or societal and global in nature. The struggles within TEN DAYS have been for control of the direction of the program, who sets the agenda? What is, or should be, the profile of power and control? Does the direction for the program emanate from the local committees, which is certainly the view of these interview participants, or from a central authority in central Canada? At issue here is the inherent tension between the "prophetic" and the "priestly" church in that the challenge to TEN DAYS lies precisely in the challenge which the prophetic nature of the program itself poses to the institutional, priestly church. Max Weber (1922) observed that

> the personal call is the decisive element distinguishing the prophet from the priest. The latter lays claim to authority by virtue of his service in a sacred tradition, while the prophet's claim is based on personal revelation and charisma. It is no accident that almost no prophets have emerged from the priestly class. (p. 46)

Increased Understanding and Solidarity

In this category the prevailing decision-making model used by TEN DAYS participants is seen as a means of improving the involvement in and commitment to decisions taken by committees and program representatives. The integrity of the community is paramount importance, as are the individual members of which the community is composed. The

121

continual challenge of progress through consensus while resisting the imposition of the will of some on others is a difficult balancing act. The impact of TEN DAYS on the individual Albertans and Canadians most closely involved in the program was observed and is closely related to the identification of constituencies for global education initiatives, that is, recognizing who is affected by and who has an interest in addressing the issues and concerns of global education. The domestic issues in global education, which affect us most immediately and intimately where we live, reveal themselves, upon closer examination, to be inextricably tied to the first theme of this chapter. International solidarity, the connections between the international and the local, the global-local nexus is the essence and the strength of this project.

Decision-making Models

A central issue of organizational practice pertains to the decision-making models in the TEN DAYS approach to global education.

Individual or Community?

Interview participants agreed there are, generally speaking, substantive and qualitative differences in the ways in which men and women arrive at decisions, at least in the context of the TEN DAYS experience. In this theme, participants identified decision-making as consensus, rather than majority rule, nurturing versus decision-making roles, collaborative leadership, and hierarchical versus flat organizational structure. Men seem to take a simple majority rule orientation ("50 +1") to come to decisions quickly while women seem to favour nurturing group members and dialogue, however long it takes, to sort out decisions. These claims will be articulated throughout this theme section.

The need to have the group come to a decision through consensus is a major issue, no matter how long the process takes so long as everyone agrees, or at least no one is completely opposed. This is in striking contrast to other models which emphasize the need to come to a decision as quickly as possible, on the basis of the "50 +1" principle of majority rule, if necessary, and get on to the next item on the agenda. Sarah observed that

> it behooves the women to keep in there and make the decisions and influence the men to be involved. Sometimes it's the way men and women make decisions. TEN DAYS tends to be sitting around talking in groups in hypothetical situations and we talk around the facts, which I think women do better than men. Sometimes we come away from a meeting with no decisions made but we're willing to go back to another meeting and carry on, where the males tend to have to have decisions made on the facts before them and proceed. (26 June 2000)

122

In discussion with Rebekah (23 September 2000) the work of Christina Baldwin's (1994) work was recommended as foundational for clearer insight into the model and processes of decision-making relevant to TEN DAYS. As Baldwin (1994) defines consensus, it

> is the process of coming to agreement by everyone. To reach *consensus*, people talk through an idea, a direction, and decision, until everyone present is able to agree on the action to be taken. This does not mean one person gives in, but discussion continues until all points of view have been shared, aired, and a *new vision* develops that takes everyone's contributions into account and creates something that was not in anyone's mind when the discussion began (p. 231). [Furthermore] *consensus is a process in which all participants have to come to agreement before a decision goes forward or action is taken* (p. 212).

Changes in group dynamics are evident, depending on the composition of local TEN DAYS committees. Over the years, there have been times when there have been no men on the local and area TEN DAYS committees. The decision-making process under those circumstances has been quite different from when there are males present, especially male clergy. There seems to be an assumption on the part of both women and men that the leadership role devolves to males, when present. In Ruth's experience, *"there is the situation where a man joins a committee and he, and everyone else, assumes he ought to be the chairperson. The group decision-making process can be uncomfortable for him until he tries it"* (26 July 2000). Under these circumstances the consensus model of decision-making often gives way to majority rule and there is less deliberate attention given to ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to participate. It was not clear that the men who join tend to drop out due to this consensus style. Those who continue to participate in the program do adapt to this model of decision-making.

Further, the nature of TEN DAYS as a faith-based programme organized, initially, by (clergy)men and subsequently managed and directed almost exclusively by women raises questions about comparative gender-related societal roles. Some interview participants were of the opinion that throughout history women have taken on the nurturing role and it is no different with TEN DAYS. Rebekah, in reference to Baldwin's work, drew attention to the view that "the time has come for women to accept their spiritual responsibility for our planet" (Anderson & Hopkins, 1991).

There are issues of hierarchical leadership, hierarchical structures, generally, and patriarchy (Baldwin, 1994, p. 233-236) which need to be examined and analyzed in greater detail. However, in the context of this present study, we will limit ourselves to these preliminary observations regarding a collaborative style of leadership and a consensus model of

decision-making. This may not be representative of, or applicable to, TEN DAYS in any general sense, but it was identified by Rebekah (23 September 2000) as influential, and is one popularized by Christina Baldwin (1994), endorsed by others such as Matthew Fox, and largely based on the aboriginal "First Culture" and the First Nations concept of "circling." As Baldwin (1994) explains it, the First Culture

is where we are rooted; the flowering of human community based on the campfire and council, where the circle flourished in kinship-based tribal groups across the globe. First culture groups use the circle to combine governing council with spiritual counsel.

By contrast, the Second Culture

is the place where Western society now finds itself. Second culture is a 'triangle culture', a hierarchy in which power is concentrated at the top and imposed upon those at the bottom.

And, the Third Culture

is the realm of the possible; an amalgam of the past and present where our ancient and intuitive knowledge may combine with our present experience to create a society where each person is empowered and encouraged to make the offering they have been born to make. (p. 232)

Following Baldwin (1994) for further clarification of some central concepts of a non-hierarchical, or "flat-line structure" for decision-making, we find that "a PeerSpirit circle is a council held together by consensual authority. Council is not just another discussion group; it is a called circle, a conscious act of coming together." PeerSpirit circling involves three fundamental principles:

1. *Rotating Leadership.* Every person helps the circle function by assuming small increments of leadership.

2. *Shared Responsibility.* Each person pays attention to what needs doing or saying next, and is willing to do their share.

3. *Reliance on the Spiritual.* Reliance on Spirit is the commitment within the group to call upon some mysterious inner / outer element to guide the overall intention and direction of the group (pp. 196, 234-236).

Likewise, with the TEN DAYS network, as Ruth pointed out

there is a clear preference for a flat-line structure for decision-making as opposed to a patriarchal or hierarchical structure. TEN DAYS is counter-culture, so it's challenging. I think it's more a female than male model, that is, it's not patriarchal; the program attracts more women and youth than it does men. We find fewer men on the committees than women. At least two-thirds of TEN DAYS participants are women. Among the youth there may be more males but it depends on the group. In any case, it's usually the women that get it started. (26 July 2000)

There are also practical difficulties which confront an organization governed mainly by

124

women in a society where,

> *most of the decision-makers are men. To be faced with a group that is made up largely of women is not to have the same credibility. Part of the lack of attraction of the program for men is that it is counter-culture and more directly challenges the male goals of being the individual who succeeds monetarily and politically. To take on something that's counter-culture is to challenge one's own goals for living as well as one's ethical values. Lots of men have strong ethical values that are perhaps in contradiction with their lifestyles. Women do too. However, in our society men are raised to have a job and to succeed at work. Women are raised to be nurturers and look after the family. There are differences: there are men who are nurturers and there are women who are workers, but we teach our boys to work hard and succeed at work and bring home the money and become as influential as they can, as important as they can. That is setting the individual ahead of the community. A lot of what we're talking about in TEN DAYS is shining more of a focused light on community and off the individual. There are times when individuals need to sacrifice a bit for the benefit of the community. Like the corporate executive needs to sacrifice a bit of his profit so that the person in the mail room can have a living wage. Our society doesn't promote that, so these ideas are seen as counter-culture.* (Ruth, 26 July 2000)

Ruth provided another illustration of the the male/female bias regarding the structure of TEN DAYS which is that

> *by and large men don't come out to these programs the way women do. If we can get a male media figure or a male politician or a male businessman to participate in the program, we get men out. Far more men than we would if we have a woman or somebody who's not recognized in the political or business arenas. I don't know if it's the people we feature or the issues (coffee and clothing are more women's issues). International debt? People, issues, style we use, and the way we frame the issues, appeals to the feminine side? Perhaps men are looking for entertainment and recreation for their evenings rather than something that looks like more work. We used to have male pastors on our committee, sometimes they would recruit other lay men and there was a good balance. But for the past six or eight years we have had only women. The pastors have become too busy. At the retreats most of the people are women. I wonder if the programs and local committees would have more credibility if there were more men. When we had more men on our committee we had more involvement on the committee. Men plead that their jobs are too demanding. We didn't lose their support but we lost them as active committee members.* (26 July 2000)

It is not clear whether these differences arise because, as Rebekah observed (23 September 2000), this is, and always has been, "womens' work," or, as Ruth said, that *"the issues which TEN DAYS seeks to deal with are by and large women's issues because women are the poor people, children are the poor people"* (26 July 2000). In fact, it may well be the issues. It is observable that within a given class, category or level of wealth or material prosperity, women and children are generally less privileged than men. Similarly, within organizations which deal with social concerns, the more power, prestige and material reward associated with a position, the more likely it is occupied by a male. Horizontal occupational segregation occurs where different types of work, physical or service, for example, are done

predominantly by men rather than women, and vice versa. Vertical occupational segregation is more relevant within a particular type of work. The "caring" professions are remarkable for their adherence to the hierarchical model where elementary school teachers, primary health providers, front-line social and church workers are predominantly women and the more influential and authoritative administrative offices are reserved largely for men. "Even in societies where horizontal occupational segregation is eroded by policies emphasizing social equality, a high degree of vertical occupational segregation persists" (Marshall, 1998, p. 167).

In the end, what does seem clear is that the involvement of women in these particular areas is a social reality and there is a definite sense that at least some are steering a different course from most of their male counterparts in other organizations in civil society. This same sense is reflected in an observation by Frank & Fuentes (1990):

> different kinds of social movements . . . . women's, peace, environmental, and community movements . . . offer widespread opportunities for coalitions among social movements. Moreover, thanks to their preponderance of women, they also manifest more communal, participatory, democratic, mutual support, and networking instead of hierarchical relations among their participants and offer hope for their greater spread through society. (p. 171)

In sum, there are clear differences in overall decision-making styles between women and men; between consensus and majority rule. The need for constructive collaboration between all people is not in dispute; the means of arriving at acceptable collective decisions is, however. As more people become aware of the power and utility of flat-line or consensual decision-making using some variant of the "first and future culture" preference for "circling" based on a consensual authority, we may see fewer injustices arising from the imposition of the will of the stronger (through wealth or numbers) on the weaker. Privileging collective values above the individual challenges widely-held perceptions in North America; it is counter-cultural. This may explain the apparent lack of interest men have in issues which are central to TEN DAYS, to the extent that the way in which decisions are made is one of the issues fundamental to the whole notion of participatory development. While it is clear that women have a traditional role as nurturers in society, community, family, it is less clear how much influence societal expectations have in producing and amplifying contradictions which discourage men from engaging in similar roles. Nor did study participants suggest ways in which they thought gender balance within TEN DAYS could be improved without moving towards a more hierarchical model.

Impact of Program on Research Participants

Perhaps the most important indicator of TEN DAYS programme success is the individual change reported by participants. There was consensus that, as Mary said,

> *it makes a difference to the individual who is involved in the process. As the individual becomes involved and takes action it changes who they are not only in the TEN DAYS network but changes who they are in how they live life, whether in their other form of professional work or how they raise their kids, how they vote, and so forth.* (30 May 2000)

This is in accord with the findings reported by Reeve & Allan (2000) in their nation-wide survey of TEN DAYS participants where the "difference that participation in ecumenical justice work has made in their lives" is most notable in their "deepened understanding of global injustice, and the hope from participating in efforts to make a difference in the world" (p. 30).

Reeve & Allan (2000) also found that

> For a majority of respondents, the aspect of the program viewed as most important is the links created between local and global issues. This is backed in naming as principles strong concern for partnership, solidarity, collaboration and networking. It seems that participants in TEN DAYS increasingly perceive justice work as one task, and recognize themselves as part of a global citizens movement resisting the effects of globalization, restructuring and economic injustice in every part of the world. (p. 19)

Identifying Constituencies and Global Education

In the interview process, it was apparent that participants were aware of the Mandate of TEN DAYS as set out in the 1976 *Policy Statement* and as re-affirmed in the 1995 *Agreement to Re-mandate*. Participants agreed that the constituencies are primarily PLURA people working in community with the general public, other groups and social movements. This cooperation takes place both ecumenically and on an inter-faith basis. Although the requirement of church affiliation may be a limitation for direct participation in TEN DAYS it does not affect conscious efforts to link and cooperate with groups, organizations, and NGOs having concerns similar to those of TEN DAYS. As Sarah and others observed, TEN DAYS people are also active in other social justice oriented groups in other constituencies: *"people involved in social justice make the links for TEN DAYS; TEN DAYS is just part of that whole picture."* While avoiding overt proselytization, participants agreed, as Sarah went on to explain, that

> *the basic influence of the theological rationale of TEN DAYS carries on into the rest of your social justice work. It's all part and parcel of the whole picture. The direct linkages made with the global picture, through TEN DAYS, help those working in the local issues to look at what's happening in other areas of the world and see the same things happening right here in town. So, we'll support these*

local people but it's not funded through or part of TEN DAYS programming although the ideas are fostered through it. (26 June 2000)

Mary stressed the importance of *"connecting the local with the global,"* of linking with global partners within the context of the faith-based nature of the program and organization. As she said,

*at the moment TEN DAYS is based on the faith traditions of the five mainline churches but very open to interfaith. There is that element that sustains and gives the foundation to the people who are involved in working but there is also a real evolution that it expand to be **inter-faith**. Many of the local committees are inter-faith and are not just the five mainline churches, which still allows for a spiritual element and a respect for one another's faith tradition. That is part of the networking.* (30 May 2000)

Paul pointed to a concern that although

there are links and cooperation with other secular groups in Canadian society, we're not necessarily getting those people into TEN DAYS. Probably what we need to do is organize projects which are not TEN DAYS but which other groups are interested in and they can feel it's theirs and then we can join together. That's what seems to have happened in the local arena. But it has been like an ideal for years, rather than a reality . . . .We're not getting out into the community enough. (6 July 2000)

The realities of global education mean, as Ruth observed,

we have to identify particular constituencies because we simply can't design a program that meets everyone where they're at. Part of being a change agent, of transforming, is you have to have something in common with the person you're suggesting change to. One of the implications for the TEN DAYS program would be to focus on women's groups, like church women's groups, like women's institutes, business and professional women's groups; something we haven't done. We've targeted youth, for reasons already mentioned. (26 July 2000)

Ruth went on to explain that

because we're ecumenically based, we target church audiences, but we also target the general public with our education and awareness programs through public events and through the media. This means that when you identify a particular constituency you then choose your issue because it's an issue of that constituency. You design your materials to meet that constituency where they are and you use techniques that are effective teaching tools for that particular constituency. So you design your program around them. (26 July 2000)

With funding and other resource constraints, choosing priorities has sometimes resulted in greater comparative emphasis on the primary constituency, of necessity. Ruth concluded that, in any case, *"part of this question has to do with TEN DAYS, in the initial stages, targeting the Church with the intention of moving to the larger Canadian society, over time"* (26 July 2000).

Broadly speaking, TEN DAYS appeals to, and is part to, a growing global constituency of counter- or anti-systemic movements. Over a thirty-year period, TEN DAYS moved steadily from a narrow focus on global and development education within and for the member / sponsoring church constituencies, to a broader, more inclusive societal focus, including international involvement in various fora, movements, organizations and coalitions. In a general sense, there is one movement with many parts which resists the growing impulse toward neo-liberal globalism. Within that broad resistance, there are many facets and TEN DAYS is representative of one aspect or facet but can collaborate or cooperate with many other individual groups and organizations which work toward the self-preservation or self-protection of global society (Polanyi, 1944).

Domestic Issues in Global Education and International Solidarity

There was early resistance (both from within and from without the program) to the linking by TEN DAYS of domestic Canadian development issues to global issues of development for at least two reasons: (1) there was a point of view that a choice had to be made between a focus on global issues and concerns of social justice or a focus on domestic concerns, it was not possible to concentrate on both as they were conceptually distinct issues; and, not unrelated, (2) the awareness that an examination of unjust social relations in Canada was politically dangerous, a focus on problems "somewhere out there" was safer, less contentious, and certainly less likely to disturb important, influential elements of the churches and other constituencies upon which TEN DAYS depended for its very existence. However, by the late 1980s and early 1990s it was evident that this unnatural separation of the domestic from the international could not continue. The 1995 *Agreement to Re-Mandate* sets out the parameters of this point very clearly. The following statement is taken from the section entitled "Our Global Reality."

> A significant evolution has been taking place in the TEN DAYS network . . . from being a 'Third World development education program' to becoming a 'global justice network'. Over the years people in the TEN DAYS network discovered that there were many parallels in Canada to the problems of poverty and injustice experienced by people in the Third World. We are all affected by the globalization of the world economy. Supporting struggles for justice and sustainable human development in the South will continue to be the primary objective for TEN DAYS. However, we have also come to realize that we cannot be in true solidarity with our sisters and brothers in the South unless we were also engaged in efforts to bring about justice in our own communities and nation. Indeed, this challenge was often brought to us by the Third World visitors who participated in the TEN DAYS program.
>
> A particular contribution TEN DAYS can make to Canadian struggles for justice is to help build links with sisters and brothers in the South who have confronted and struggled with similar problems. TEN DAYS will work in close collaboration with those globally facing similar challenges, supporting each other in resisting the de-

humanizing impact of globalization as well as working together to develop and promote alternatives which would put people and creation first.

Taking a global justice approach is also a key to engaging new constituencies in Canada who have not traditionally been involved in Third World development issues. We can help people to see the global dimensions of issues that are of immediate concern to them and help to build links with others in the world who are struggling for similar objectives.

In seeking justice, TEN DAYS also affirms the importance of working together with those most adversely affected. This means giving priority to working in Canada and in the South with groups of the poor, women, aboriginal peoples, people of colour and disabled persons. (p. 2)

Interview participants are in substantial agreement with this position as their remarks and observations indicate. As Sarah expressed it, in world development, it is no longer *us and them; the global picture is the same for everybody. We are all affected by wealth, poverty, racial / ethnic tensions and conflict. We have the situation of Third World visitors pointing to these problems in our midst in Canada, Alberta, Edmonton and other communities, asking: 'What are you doing about the social justice concerns in your own constituencies?'* (26 June 2000)

Paul felt that sometimes the reluctance to link domestic and international issues is because *the priority of education or action is in part decided at the national level of TEN DAYS. Then the denominational representatives decide where it's going. Perhaps the denominational representatives, when working on the program, won't necessarily emphasize the Canadian situation, in case there's some embarrassment, although that seems to be changing.* (6 July 2000)

Confronting these issues at a local, regional level concretizes them. Sarah's opinion was *We have to do that in our own constituency or area and that makes it more relevant and more real to people. We see more clearly how we are part of the whole picture, and when it comes to our local region, we can say we've got poor in our city; why are they poor? Or, food banks are important but why do we need them in the fist place? People start thinking along those lines and it promotes the justice that's needed. So there's recognition of local issues and concerns which need to be addressed as well as recognition of similarities between local conditions and those in other parts of the world. The goals of education and action become somewhat more realizable. Education becomes more relevant.* (26 June 2000)

She continued, observing that we also have *resources from the national office of TEN DAYS which identify underlying causes and local groups relate those to our local situations. They can be different for different areas in the province or the country. The resources that are provided to us relating to the underlying issues give us a basis for what we are doing in our local community and some insights into why a certain situation is happening, to understand it's because we're allowing people to be poor and homeless or we're allowing our government to not address an issue that needs to be dealt with on a governmental level. This way we can have the education and facts and resources to address the situation here in our own community.* (26 June 2000)

Paul also observed that there are other important aspects which need to be recognized:

> It may be possible to see some of this in the Canadian church schools where what we're saying about what's happened in the Third World has happened here. And we're not quite blameless ourselves. We'll help people in Africa, for example, but don't look at our our own situation. What's not happening here is that while we talk about the poor everywhere else we can ignore the people on Boyle Street, for instance. (6 July 2000)

He went on to say that at all events, *"more could be done. The main thing has to be global justice, which includes Canada, of course. But people are more excited by 'out there' than here. It grabs people. Unfortunately, it's true"* (6 July 2000).

Ruth's view is also that

> there is a need to make the local connection with issues. To put a face on the international issues. It solidifies and affirms our interconnectedness with the global issues. It meets the need to focus on local action where we can see the results; it provides a model and a cause for celebration. Cleaning up our own act while working internationally is an important part of participatory development. Experiential learning is a method of incarnating the education. It is popular education which gives us a taste of what it would be like to actually be in a particular situation. (26 July 2000)

The complete question, as asked of interview participants was, "What is the place of domestic development issues and response to those issues in development education (global education) which prioritize an international focus?" As we have seen, from program participants' perspectives, an educational program "which prioritizes an international focus" will logically focus on domestic issues as a point of connection, to contextualize, concretize, de-mystify the linkages. The increasingly "global" nature of world socio-economic and political relations was becoming evident to many in the 1970s, at the birth of TEN DAYS. By the time of Larson's (1988) major study, "neo-liberal globalism" was clearly a force to be reckoned with. Today, the phenomenon has taken on the appearance and character of a rudderless juggernaut, even to the extent that some of the greatest beneficiaries of international speculative finance have voiced their alarm and astonishment:

> Challenges to neo-liberal globalism are coming from disparate sources: intellectuals, corporate and political leaders, and citizens' movements . . . . Ironically, challenges are also coming from business leaders. Sir James Goldsmith, the richest man in Europe, wrote about the free trade doctrine: 'What an astounding thing it is to watch a civilization destroy itself because it is unable to re-examine the validity, under totally new circumstances, of an economic ideology' (1994). George Soros, who made billions in currency transactions, wrote that 'untrammelled intensification of laissez-faire capitalism and the spread of market values to all areas of life are endangering our open and democratic society' (1997). World Bank head, James Wolfenson (1997), questions economic growth as the primary measure of a society's progress. Some leaders of the new right are joining left commentators as critics of globalism. 'Broken homes, uprooted families, vanished dreams, delinquency, vandalism, crime,' writes Pat Buchanan (1998), Reagan's speech

writer, 'these are the hidden costs of free trade'. Leading Thatcherite, John Gray, states that 'free markets are creatures of state power, and persist only so long as the state is able to prevent human needs for security and the control of economic risk from finding political expression' (1998). (Parkland Institute, 2000, *The Globalism Project*).

The evidence is fairly conclusive: the popular perception (well beyond the TEN DAYS constituency) is that time is short, even in geological and planetary terms, let alone in terms of the daily human struggles for basic survival. The TEN DAYS initiative is an important Canadian contribution in working toward the primary goal of responsible global adult education: "Learning our Way Out" as responsible global citizens working locally to democratically implement the Law of Humanity in local/global civil society.

Chapter Six: Implications, Interpretations, Recommendations

This chapter will present a synthesis and concise summary of findings and conclusions, some recommendations for enhancing the development / global education praxis of CSOs (civil society organizations) like TEN DAYS, and suggestions for further study. In the context of clarification of root causes of violence and identification of non-violent strategies for building a more peaceful world, the goals and objectives of building a culture of peace, at the heart of global education generally and TEN DAYS for Global Justice, are examined for coherence in this regard. A culture of peace recognizes that diversity in the global community can and does result in conflict, however the demand is for "non-violent solutions and . . . the transformation of violent competition into co-operation for shared goals" (Toh, 1999, p.1). Therefore, the major questions which this study sought to address were:

       (1) From the perspectives and insights of a sample of key Alberta organizers and leaders of TEN DAYS, what are the core goals, objectives and strategies of the group with regard to the global education of Canadians?

       (2) In the view of these leaders to what degree have TEN DAYS' strategies of global education been effective in fulfilling the organization's goals and objectives? What obstacles have been encountered, and how have they been faced or overcome?

       (3) Based on the experiences of TEN DAYS as a long-standing NGO committed to increasing the understanding and solidarity of Canadians to global issues of development, aid and related problems, what positive and negative lessons may be drawn to enhance the non-formal practice of global education in general, and the future work of TEN DAYS in particular?

       (4) Drawing upon the theory and practice of global education that is expanding worldwide, what paradigmatic emphasis can be found in the goals, objectives and strategies of TEN DAYS and what implication will such emphasis hold for the "success" of TEN DAYS as a non-formal global education agency in the 21st century?

Major Findings

Core Goals and Objectives

The core goal has been humanization, putting people and creation first, in the context of ecumenical Christian witness, initially, moving to inter-faith and solidarity with social justice-oriented groups and organizations working in the areas of development and education. The objectives of TEN DAYS were found to be fulfilled reasonably well, within the limits of financial constraints and restructuring. The production and distribution of development education resource materials for use in parishes, congregations and community groups was accomplished in a regular and timely manner during the life of the programme. The creation of InterChurch and community groups which encouraged awareness and action in development education at the local or regional level was stimulated and supported

to the extent possible, again given financial and other resource constraints. National programmes of development education and suggested strategies and supports for programmes at local and national levels are regularly evaluated by TEN DAYS participants, national staff and representatives of the PLURA churches (Presbyterian, Lutheran, United, Roman Catholic, and Anglican).

Effectiveness of Global Education Strategies and ongoing Challenges
From TEN DAYS participants we find that certain strategies have been effective in addressing some of these concerns. For example, the Third World Visitor program was considered to be highly effective and as recognition of the links and international interconnectedness grew, the importance of examining the South in the North assumed greater importance. Canadians, either with roots and experience in South countries, or experiences and knowledge of poverty, discrimination, marginalization in Canada, came to be seen as resource people who could make the links more real, and "give a face to" the South in the North, to the palpable effects of globalization, privatization, and structural adjustment programs.

The increased user-friendliness or accessibility of TEN DAYS program resources was recognized as an improvement. Materials were more explicitly geared for people at different stages in their knowledge, interest, awareness, and desire or need for action. There was more intentional use of popular education techniques where a focus on specific issues and associated action possibilities is highly effective and useful. There has been less focus on general background to global justice / development issues as it was assumed that TEN DAYS participants and the general public had higher levels of awareness after years of educational work to raise church and public awareness of issues.

The youth initiative is both an obligation and a necessity. The program(s) cannot continue without new members, and young people need direction or help in gaining a critical perspective on issues of global justice. An earlier example was Czerny and Swift's (1988) introductory publication, *Getting Started on Social Analysis in Canada.*

Networking is an essential part of the global education strategy and is growing at every level worldwide. Especially important are the links with international peoples' movements.

Training and support for TEN DAYS global educators was rated highly, although the limited resources available through the churches means participation is restricted to people

of somewhat independent means who can afford to subsidize the program, with both time and money. Resource materials, regional and national training events, and support from other coalitions are also valuable assistance to TEN DAYS global educators.

Control of program direction is challenged from different perspectives: the priestly-prophetic tension, the order versus change orientation, and central versus regional / local control. Contradictions are inherent in TEN DAYS as a fringe movement supported and funded by the institutional churches and the federal government through CIDA, both of which are the targets implicitly and explicitly of much of the development and global education critique advanced by the program. Clearly, in spite of the tensions which must exist between the "prophetic" and "priestly" elements of the Church, TEN DAYS would not have come into existence, nor would it continue to exist, without the support of the institutional church. This support, financial and otherwise, does carry with it costs. In this case, one cost is in the form of certain ideological constraints which establish boundaries beyond which TEN DAYS cannot go with regard to ideas, insights, visions and frameworks of global education.

Funding constraints and issues of restructuring were a source of considerable preoccupation. First, TEN DAYS is not the highest priority of priestly administrators and accountants. Second, the need for restructuring was generally accepted, the concern centred on how it was being done and the outcome. In the event, it was probably a good thing and perhaps even at the right time, bringing together various related interChurch coalitions after thirty years of working separately on social justice issues. Perhaps now is the time for concerted cooperation and collaboration, a focus on the real, ongoing struggles which cannot be won singlehandedly. During the next years and decades of transition to a new world order, there is need to focus, concentrate, marshal forces. A timely convergence of social justice, education, and development NGOs and CSOs is part of "naming the moment," this historical conjunctural moment when various forces (economic, political and ideological) have created a space or opportunity where particular action(s) can be highly effective (Barndt, 1989). This is one such moment and the focusing of the energy and resources of TEN DAYS and related coalitions may be most appropriate.

As the world community, rich and poor alike, global civil society moves into a new epoch, as we stand on the cusp of momentous change, it is not clear what comes next. Whatever it is it will be different. Better, worse, or just "different" remains to be seen. One thing that is clear is if we truly want a future "based on non-violence and respect for fundamental rights

and freedoms, on understanding, tolerance and solidarity, on the sharing and free flow of information and on the full participation and empowerment of women" (UNESCO, 1992) then the forces in this world who will benefit from the establishment and growth of "deep democracy" (the people) have to choose that route, not be mystified by the language and propaganda of the globalizers, by the neoliberal ideology of globalism which appropriates the language and the concepts of globalization-from-below, the truly democratizing impulses. The special danger for members, actors, and campaigners in the global civil society is being coopted by the globalizers, being unwittingly divided and confused, sapping the energy and resources of popular movements around the world. Here, one of the great advantages TEN DAYS has over other NGOs and CSOs is precisely the support from the priestly institutional churches which provide a larger overview of the world situation and may alert some participants to the dangers to CSOs who cannot recognize the agenda of the globalizers.

Apathy was consistently identified as a serious obstacle, barrier, challenge to the work of TEN DAYS, to the realization of the global justice goals of global education. One view is that in very real ways the dominant liberal ideology has contributed to this condition. As Marchak (1988) observes,

> The strength of the liberal ideology lies in its apparent accommodation of diversity. All people are equal, all choices are legitimate, all alternatives are worthy. Good and evil are relative terms, and the latitude for personal action is wide. Life is a market-place of competing claims for the attention of consumers. Having no apparent philosophical commitment to a hierarchy of values, the liberal must pose all problems as questions of strategy. Such questions are solved by the application of scientific research and the probing of the general will. For this reason, liberalism never appears to its adherents as an ideology . . . . [rather] as simply a common-sense approach to life. (pp.76-77)

However, and this is the direct link with apathy observed and experienced by TEN DAYS study participants,

> when each man can choose his own moral obligations, there are no guarantees that a variety of social demands will be met. No lord is responsible for the poor, no employers for the unemployed, no upper class for the lower class. The young are not obliged to care for the old, the healthy for the sick, the educated for the ignorant. The moral obligations of manufacturers to consumers, corporations to employees, universities to the public, mass media to viewers and readers, and governments to voters are all extremely vague. To answer that the solutions are matters of strategy is to assume that without moral obligation, and in spite of the ideology of achievement, individualism, material profit, and personal success, people and institutions will somehow ignore their private interests and act on behalf of the society as a whole whenever the two pose different requirements. Strategies are worked out after values and goals are chosen; they are means to desired ends.

Desires are translated into action to the extent that people are able to make this translation. In a society where wealth is of the utmost importance, those with wealth can translate more desires into actions than those without wealth. There is no reason to expect them to put the desires of others above their own, and it is not surprising if they assume that their own desires are congruent with the social good . . . . [which] becomes whatever the will of the majority defines it to be . . . and subject to the decisions already made within the economic sphere not by the governments at all but by non-elected directors whose liberty is unimpaired by democratic procedures. (pp. 77-78)

C. Wright Mills (1959) approached the problem or condition of apathy this way:
When people cherish some set of values and do not feel any threat to them, they experience well-being. When they cherish values but do feel them to be threatened, they experience a crisis--either as personal trouble or as public issue. And if all their values seem involved, they feel the total threat of panic. But suppose people are neither aware of any cherished values nor experience any threat? That is the experience of indifference, which, if it seems to involve all their values, becomes apathy. Suppose, finally, they are unaware of any cherished values, but still are very much aware of a threat? That is the experience of uneasiness, of anxiety, which, if it is total enough, becomes a deadly unspecified malaise. . . . And it is this condition, of uneasiness and indifference, that is the signal feature of our period (Mills, 1959, in Ksenych & Liu, 1996, pp. 11-12).

For both Marchak and Mills the centrality of values is clear. As we have seen, the preferred development paradigm (transformation and conversion) also focuses on values; the basic principles of global education for peace, human rights, and democracy has at its centre values and attitudes which promote a peaceful world. This seems to be a strong endorsement for the wider dissemination of the work of organizations such as TEN DAYS to provide an antidote to this "deadly unspecified malaise," this remarkable combination of "uneasiness and indifference."

Other challenges include an aging constituency, concerns about media focus and orientation regarding development and global justice issues, and access to power brokers. A continued and expanded focus on replenishing the ranks through the youth initiative is required, as is continued popular education, awareness and action regarding globalization-from-below and organization and mobilization for education and empowerment, if possible, and to pressurise power brokers, as necessary.

Increased Understanding and Solidarity

The democratic model of decision-making by consensus is an important feature of TEN DAYS. The more truly or "deeply" democratic decisions are "owned" by participants in a way that is not possible when decisions are made and imposed on others by small majorities, even large minorities. Here, everyone agrees with a decision before it is made.

The process is cumbersome, demanding and time-consuming but it is a process which makes TEN DAYS unique.

In recent years, a greater concentration of attention on the influence of the G7/8-IFIs-WTO complex has become evident. Formerly unaccountable organizations, such as the World Bank and the international Monetary Fund, whose activities were cloaked in mystery and silence are now being asked to admit to their council chambers representatives of the very people whose lives they are ruining with structural adjustment programs, conditionalities, trade liberalization, growing crops for export as local people go hungry. Recognition of the IFIs (international financial institutions) as the command centres of the global economy which influence much of the rest of world affairs is an important turning point in the demand for sustainable human development. Working to discover how it came to be and how Debt Enslavement can be eradicated, TEN DAYS has been an important part of this focus on the IFIs, particularly through involvement in the Jubilee Debt campaign.

The impact of considerations of race, class and gender are important for programs like TEN DAYS. The uniformity of race, class, gender, age, education, occupation-type and other major attributes or characteristics of TEN DAYS participants was noted and is representative of the composition of the organization represented--mainline churches. The question arises as to whether this organizational profile is something that can or should be changed, or if the important thing is to have a critical awareness of the reality and to work with other organizations which do represent other ethnic, class, gender interests, characteristics, or elements of local, regional, national and global society. One outcome of the organizational composition is that participants are able to subsidize the program through their volunteer activities, having discretionary time and money to be able to participate.

The reality of development practice may be different from the ideal. For example, current plans to change the nature of the relationship between African states and industrialized states in the North have been advanced in the form of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) which is intended to promote conditions whereby Africa can assume its rightful place in the world. One view is that the proposal sets the stage for a new relationship with partners, it focuses on African ownership, management, and self-reliance, and on poverty reduction. Another view is that, of course, it is important to address these issues but, in fact, African governments did not consult their own people in civil society, and "the economic strategy at the heart of the NEPAD is based on the discredited package of IMF / World Bank inspired economic policies that have been implemented by African

countries for the past two decades with disastrous effects for their economies" (Mihevc, 2002, p. 6).

Perhaps the most significant outcome of discussions, conversations and interviews associated with this study has been confirmation of the recognition of the importance of linking developmental issues, of the existence of the "South" in the "North" and making the connections between the various issues of local and global concern. The web of interconnectedness acknowledges the orientation, views, perspectives from Third World visitors--from abroad and from within Canada. One section in the 1995 Agreement to Re-Mandate, "Our Global Reality," explicitly recognized the links, hence the need for global justice.

The praxis approach to popular and participatory education, education for focused action, reflection, and further action has been adapted and adopted by other groups and organizations active in social justice concerns.

The strength of faith-based organizations, the power of a spiritual foundation, and the utility of a sound theological rationale for social justice orientation was important. Closely related was the importance and value of networking and solidarity to provide support and encouragement to the work of TEN DAYS. Networking at local, regional, national and international levels has become a ubiquitous feature of social justice organizations. One concern is that to the extent electronic networking is accessible principally by individuals and organizations in the "North," the gap between the rich and the poor, between the "haves" and the "have nots," is widening all the more rapidly. On the other hand, to the extent that these same organizations seek to impose their culturally- and regionally-specific prescriptions to particular social conditions in other parts of the world, it may not be a bad thing that this limited access proscribes their influence. In any case, the growing capacity for individuals, groups, organizations to mobilize around common issues and concerns does seem to be one positive outcome of globalization.

Participatory program monitoring and evaluation is one of the great strengths and successes of TEN DAYS which provides input, feedback, direction, a sense of ownership, partnership, inclusion the decision-making process, empowerment, belonging to the organization, and it promotes and encourages consensus among participants.

Implication for Theory and Practice of Global Education

The transformative paradigm of development and global education requires both empowerment, or a critical analysis of global development issues, and a personal conversion to a participatory justice model of human liberation from both physical and ideological structures. The central point here is that long-term, long-lasting, and effective structural change will take place only if (finally) it is supported and reinforced by, and based upon individual change in personal values, perceptions and concepts. The unambiguous, unmistakable finding that the most noticeable influence or impact of TEN DAYS is on the individual, in Alberta and Canada, most closely involved in the program is a testament to the power and value of global education. That this is being extended intentionally to youth and young adults is a sign of vitality and a most positive aspect of the work of TEN DAYS, as well as being a pragmatic response to ensuring the continuation of the program despite the vicissitudes inherent in being a "fringe organization."

A further consideration is the degree to which tensions and dilemmas confronting the NGO community worldwide are recognized and being addressed within TEN DAYS and successor organizations. One issue common to most non-governmental organizations is the struggle against cooptation and domestication by external globalizing forces. Here, this includes the possibility of influence by the state through its control of one of the major external sources of financial support for the program, namely CIDA. The more unique issue for TEN DAYS is the internal tension posed by the institutional church doctrines which tend to constrain the impulses of "radical democracy" (Ritzer, 1992, p. 503) toward global justice. This internal tension is one which, in principle, may be addressed through church teachings on issues of social justice.

Theological Reflection

First known as Ten Days for World Development, later Ten Days for Global Justice, the TEN DAYS programme has been part of a process, over more than a century, of adjustment and change in which certain parts of the Christian Church have explicitly recognized and named the current, dominant force for world-wide dehumanization as the capitalist world economy. The debate continues as to whether capitalism is the impersonal root cause of injustice, inequity and unconscionable inequality, or merely a symptom of other more basic, underlying forces in the human psyche tending toward domination. The view here is that domination is the fundamental theme of our epoch (Freire, 1968, p. 93), an epoch in turn dominated by the socio-economic system of capitalism, characterized by "dehumanization [which] is the result of an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressor which, in

turn, dehumanizes the oppressed" (Addo, 1981, p. 13). Capitalism is understood as one historical system among others which depends upon, and perpetuates, domination by increasingly few people over the majority of the world's population. From this perspective, ending capitalism will not end domination, but will substantially reduce it by removing some of the more serious irritants: "inequality, competition, and insecurity, all of which are essential ingredients of capitalism" (Reiman, 2001, p. 170).

The popular, collective peoples' movements and struggles worldwide are clear, concrete examples of what can be, and is being done, to promote just, equitable, sustainable ways of living with each other on this one planet. The ultimate goal of development strategies promoted by TEN DAYS is peace that is sustainable, durable at the personal, family, community, societal and world levels. At the same time, proponents of the existent world system, where unequal power and unequal access to resources is the norm, are equally aware of the shortcomings of the current configuration of capitalism. One of the predictable outcomes of leaving change to the ruling classes is that at the end of the day we will be no closer to the "deep democracy," the participatory and transformative approaches to global social organization that will truly benefit "the least of these among us" (Lk. 9:48).

There is a growing impetus among groups, organizations, movements in global civil society to concretize the Law of Humanity, to be able to live in a world where "people-centred development, sustainability, global democracy, human rights, intercultural respect, and a simple quality of life" (Toh, 1999, p. 1) are the norm, the reality for all people of the world, not an impossible dream. Evidence to support this view is based on the ongoing endorsement of the original goals of TEN DAYS and a discernible move from paternalistic notions of development to an understanding of the importance of cooperative, collaborative partnership arrangements based on solidarity and equality.

Issues and concerns related to economic globalization and corporate domination have been part of the TEN DAYS analysis / process of critically "reading the world and the word" for thirty years and conscious attempts have been made to embrace, encourage the development of "shared values, attitudes, behaviours and ways of life" conducive to the establishment of and working toward the realization of a culture of peace.

The long-term plan of TEN DAYS, in the original goals and objectives, was to initiate an education, awareness / action program, aimed first at members of the church-sponsors of TEN DAYS and expanding to the Canadian public, cooperating with other organizations

including labor, having as a focus World Development and moving to Global Justice as interconnectedness through globalization became apparent. Part of the original plan was to expand by networking and establishing coalitions to include social justice, development and education groups, NGOs, CSOs in Canada and from around the world. Finally coming to rest as an influential part of a new umbrella interChurch organization focusing on issues of globalization (including international human rights, global economic justice, environmental concerns, Canadian social development, Aboriginal peoples, and animation, education and communication for global justice) was not envisioned in 1973 but is in keeping with the overall goal of humanization, putting people and creation first, in the context of ecumenical Christian witness, initially, moving to inter-faith and solidarity with social justice-oriented groups and organizations working in the areas of development and education.

Issues of race, class, gender transcend the boundaries of the nation state and add support to the interpretations of world systems analysis where the interests of the ruling classes have no borders. The debt-slaves cannot move; they work and live out their lives in a particular prison-state, not of their choosing, while the ruling classes roam at will.

The view in this study is that the "fearful evil that is historical capitalism . . . . [and which] reaches, in its globalizing neoliberal crusade, the maximum efficacy of its intrinsically evil nature" (Freire, 1998, p. 114), was explicitly recognized by (certain elements within) the Churches and the effects widely denounced long before the establishment of TEN DAYS (see earlier discussion of the social teaching of the Catholic Church dating from the late 1800s). However, ongoing economic globalization and corporate domination of the global economic system has been at the centre of the TEN DAYS approach to first, development, and later global justice, education. The lessons of earlier generations teach us that
> in spite of the political and ethical relevance of the effort of conscientization . . . it is insufficient in itself. It is important to go on from there to the teaching of writing and reading the word . . . . The essential task . . . is to try out, with conviction and passion, the dialectical relation between a reading of the world and a reading of the the word . . . . [and] none of this makes any sense if attempted outside the socio-historical context in which men and women find themselves and within which they discover their vocation to find 'completeness', to become 'more'. (p. 79)

As we have seen, the goals of global education for peace, human Rights and democracy (or, building a culture of peace) are
> 1. to contribute to a better awareness of the root causes of conflict, violence, and peacelessness at the personal, interpersonal, community, national, regional, and international/global levels; and
> 2. to simultaneously cultivate values and attitudes which will encourage individual and social action for building more peaceful selves, families, communities, societies, and ultimately a more peaceful, just, sustainable and compassionate world. (Cawagas, & Toh,

1989)

Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy includes disarmament education, development education (alternative paradigms of development and sustainability, promoting equity and social justice), human rights education, intercultural/multicultural education, environmental education, and education for peace (including the links of personal peace to spirituality and religious traditions and their implications for education). An important component of global education is nonviolent conflict resolution, identifying root causes, where "it is acknowledged that conflicts are most effectively and sustainably resolved through principles of active nonviolence."

A final point relates to the possibilities of nonviolent conflict resolution, based on principles of active nonviolence in a global society organized in ways which promote and perpetuate inequalities, in particular the system of global capitalism which is sanctioned by the ideological hegemony of neoliberal globalism, especially including the legal and institutional presumption and preservation "of the social roles of capitalist and worker--defined by ownership and non-ownership of means of production, respectively" (Reiman, 2001, p. 211).

Liberation theologians, Freire, Roman Catholic Church traditional social teachings, the social gospel of the Protestant Churches, all support the view that limits or constraints to the possibilities of non-violent conflict resolution are established by the capitalist system which is predicated upon "antagonistic or alienated relations between human beings . . . . [where] each person's well-being is in conflict with that of others" (Reiman, 2001, p. 222). There are three conceptually distinct categories of conflict which, to varying degrees, are resistant to resolution by non-violent means: class versus class in the struggle for wages or profits; worker versus worker competing in the job market; and capitalists fighting for greater market share. However, the argument here is that

> antagonism of interests is neither a necessary feature of human life nor a desirable condition. It is caused by capitalism. It was less marked in feudalism and might be eliminated in the future if a more cooperative arrangement, such as socialism, could be established. (p. 222)

Whereas the presumption inherent in capitalist social relations that antagonism of interests is natural, inevitable, and desirable ("healthy" competition) leads to the belief that

> the rights of each are in conflict with the rights of others rather than mutually supportive, that freedom is *freedom from* invasion by others rather than freedom to develop with others, that what people owe each other is non-interference rather than a helping hand (p. 222),

and this, in fact, is neither necessary nor desirable.

To the extent it is true that the system of capitalism
> itself is based on the wrongful appropriation of means of production, and with it the power to coerce others to labor without compensation . . . . [it is held that] socialism would cure capitalism not so much by replacing antagonism of interests with harmony but by replacing private ownership of means of production by a few with social ownership by everyone. (p. 223)

In this view or possible outcome, the issue of antagonism of interests, or conflict, is not resolved; one of the major root causes is, however, removed, leaving the way more open for nonviolent strategies of conflict resolution when people are not facing continual desperate situations threatening survival. Conflict-generating situations will not disappear under any conceivable system or configuration of social organization. The point here is that the capitalist system is counter-productive, prejudicial to the health and long-term prospects of sustainability of planet earth, and, beyond being unsustainable, the inequities and inequalities are unjustifiable.

However, the overall goals of Peace / Global Education, and similarly those of development education, liberation theology, and the social teachings of the Church, are in serious conflict with the "ethic" of globalization. If ownership and control of productive resources are important root causes of conflict, violence, and peacelessness, and if the dominant, hegemonic ideology of neo-liberal globalism expressly prohibits addressing these fundamental concerns in any meaningful or realistic way, then, indeed, how do we cultivate values and attitudes which will encourage individual and social action for building a more peaceful world? The argument is made that we must submerge or transcend our "differences" or diversity while we deal with issues of who owns what and why and how to change and move toward "a new world order" where no child is born into conditions of deprivation, lacking food and water, money, housing, health care or education. Where democratic struggles worldwide are recognized as important movements in a common cause moving toward a world where real human security for all is assured.

Recommendations

The general recommendation is that the participatory and transformative development / global education of TEN DAYS (or successor organizationations) should continue, with all deliberate haste, to encourage Canadians and others in global civil society to critically analyze root causes of global-local peacelessness and violence, to make the logical connections between human injustice and human insecurity, and continue to move toward a secure, peaceful, just world order in an atmosphere of realism tempered with optimism and

hope. Related to this is the importance of recognizing the institutional and organizational strength, the moral and ethical base, the undeniable justice imperative of churches, and the position of the churches and affiliate organizations, labour and other mass movements; their potential to address the problems posed by globalization from above, not least the question of developing mechanisms for controlling capital and markets in order to privilege the safety and security of people and nature above market forces and the undemocratic state.

Specifically, the concerns raised by study participants regarding the practice of global justice education should be addressed, also as they apply to other NGOs and CSOs, in areas such as overall orientation to issues, paradigms or worldviews which shape organizations, and help to determine goals, objectives, strategies, and selection of alternatives to existing unjust social structures. Of particular significance is the continued need to make the links between local and global issues, to address environmental concerns, social and economic justice, democracy and human rights, in ways that are seen and understood to involve youth and young adults who are the future of global education initiatives in Canada and elsewhere.

Further research / study

Follow up study regarding the place of development / global education in the new KAIROS organization will be useful, particularly in light of the valuable TEN DAYS experiences over thirty years of building a respected approach to theory and practice in the field.

Recognizing the value and importance of a global perspective on issues of equity, social and economic justice, development, and sustainability which underlie education for peace, human rights, and democracy, a more intentional focus on world systems analysis may be useful in sharpening and advancing the critique of historical capitalism in the context of global education for a peaceful world. Also useful is clarifying the inherently un-peaceful spirit of capitalism or globalization. Freire (1998) forthrightly explains that

> Globalization theory, which speaks of ethics, hides the fact that its ethics are those of the marketplace and not the universal ethics of the human person . . . . [hides] that fearful evil that is historical capitalism . . . . [hides] the increasing wealth of the few and the rapid increase of poverty and misery for the vast majority of humanity. The capitalist system reaches, in its globalizing neoliberal crusade, the maximum efficacy of its intrinsically evil nature. (p. 114)

All of this leads to the further recognition of the need for a greater, more intentional focus on community organization as a defensive and offensive survival strategy. Most Canadian political leaders, elected and appointed officials, and others in positions of power at local,

regional, provincial and national levels in Canadian society seem to have little awareness of, and less interest in, the wide variety and large numbers of viable, realistic, practical alternatives to the dead-end path of "turbocapitalism." As a survival tactic, in the years and decades ahead while global capitalism is being transformed (from above and below, from within and without), and as a means of hastening the necessary change to a system which embraces the goals and objectives of global education and a culture of peace, local and regional organizations need to be re-directed to meet the needs of the people of the region on a sustainable basis.

An important and indispensable means of achieving the goals of global education (peace, human rights, and democracy) is through community action. This action needs to be informed by a global perspective, and a closer examination and greater awareness of the world systems approaches to understanding global reality may be useful. In keeping with this assessment, or speculative impression, a promising research initiative currently is being undertaken by the Parkland Institute at the University of Alberta which focuses in part on this aspect of globalization, that is, community strategies of resistance and survival. Questions may be asked about what global education has to offer with regard to how the paradigm of globalization-from-above erodes sustainability of all types: ecological, economic, political, or socio-cultural. Does the inherent lack of sustainability of the globalization from above model predispose members of the global civil society to develop pro-democratic resistances and alternatives? Does global education have a role in assessing strengths, weaknesses, tendencies, and contradictions in possible approaches to "deep democracy" at the state level, inter-nationally, or trans-nationally? At the level of the community, the family, and the lifeworld?

An investigation of the actual and potential contributions of global education perspectives to community adult education in the context of globalization and human security could offer some insights into questions about "learning our way out." A further comparative study of NGOs and CSOs which are non "faith"-based would also offer insights into ways in which differences, including different strengths and weakness, complement the overall objective of building a more peaceful, secure world for ourselves and our children unto the seventh generation and beyond.

References

Addo, H. (1981). *A world-system critique of Freire's philosophy of education: Naming the world capitalist reality.* Tokyo: United Nations University.

Alberta Council for Global Cooperation. (2002). *The G8, globalization, and human security.* Retrieved April 15, 2002, from http://web.net/acgc/resources/index.htm# resources_G8

Allman, P. (1999). *Revolutionary social transformation: Democratic hopes, political possibilities and critical education.* London: Bergin & Garvey.

Allman, P. (2001). *Critical education against global capitalism.* London: Bergin & Garvey.

Amin, S., Arrighi, G., Frank, A. G., & Wallerstein, I. (1990). *Transforming the revolution: Social movements and the world-system.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Archibugi, D. (1995). From the UN to cosmopolitan democracy. In D. Archibugi and D. Held (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan democracy: An Agenda for a new world order* (pp. 121-162). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Archibugi, D. & Held, D. (Eds). (1995). *Cosmopolitan democracy: An agenda for a new world order.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Arnal, O. (1998).*To set the captives free: Liberation theology in Canada.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Arnold, J., & Harvey, J. (1991). Reflections on sustainable development. *Canadian and International Education, 20,* (1), 87-96.

Arnold, R., Burke, B., James, C., Martin, D., & Thomas, B. (1991). *Educating for a change.* Toronto: Doris Marshall Institute for Education and Action, and Between the Lines.

Aronowitz, S. (1998). Introduction. In P. Freire, *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage* (pp. 1-19). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Arrighi, G., & Silver, B. J. (1999). *Chaos and governance in the modern world system.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Baldwin, C. (1994). *Calling the circle: The first and future culture.* Newberg, Oregon: Swan•Raven & Co.

Barndt, D. (1989). *Naming the moment: Political analysis for action.* Toronto: Jesuit Centre for Social Faith and Justice.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Braudel, F. (1984). *The perspective of the world.* New York: Harper & Row.

Brecher, J., Childs, J., & Cutler, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Global visions: Beyond the new world order.* Boston: South End Press.

Brecher, J., Costello, T., & Smith B. (2000). *Globalization from below: The power of solidarity.* Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

Capdevila, G. Oxfam Critique of WTO Triggers Reactions from All Sides. Retrieved April 12, 2002, from http://www.tradeobservatory.org/News/index

CCIC (2001). Commentary on CIDA's Long Term Strategy for International Development Assistance. Ottawa: Author.

CCIC Background Paper (2002). *Strengthening CIDA Partnerships with Canadian Civil Society Organizations.* CCIC / CIDA Consultations, April 17-18, 2002. Ottawa: Author.

CCIC Background Paper (April 2002). *The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD): A commentary.* Africa-Canada Forum, Canadian Council for International Cooperation. Ottawa: Author.

Chomsky, N. (1991). *Necessary illusions: Thought control in democratic societies.* Toronto: Anansi

Christie, J. (1983). A critical history of development education in Canada. *Canadian and International Education, 12*(3), 8-20.

Clark, T., Barlow, M., Grieshaber-Otto, J., & Finn, E. (1997). Position paper prepared for the Common Front on the World Trade Organization in Ottawa, coordinated by the Sierra Club of Canada, April 1997. Retrieved April 10, 1999, from http://www.canadians.org/mai.html

Commission on Global Governance. (1995). *Our Global Neighbourhood.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Czerny, M., & Swift, J. (1988). *Getting Started on Social Analysis in Canada.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Dalai Lama, (1999). *Ancient wisdom, modern world: Ethics for the new millennium.* London: Abacus.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Deut. 29:4 (New Revised Standard Version).

Falk, R. (1993). The making of global citizenship. In J. Brecher, J. Childs, & J. Cutler (Eds.), *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 39-50). Boston: South End Press.

Falk, R. (1995). The world order between inter-state law and the law of humanity: The role of civil society institutions. In D. Archibugi and D. Held (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan democracy: An agenda for a new world order* (pp. 163-179). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

50 Years is Enough Network. Retrieved April 12, 2002, from http://www.50years.org/factsheets/debt.html

Floresca-Cawagas, V., & Toh, S. H. (1989). Peace education in a land of suffering and hope: Insights from the Philippines. *Convergence, 23*(1), 11-22.

Frank, A. G., & Fuentes, M. (1990). Civil democracy: Social movements in recent world history. In S. Amin, G. Arrighi. A. G. Frank, & I Wallerstein, *Transforming the revolution: Social movements and the world-system* (pp. 139-180). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Frank, A. G, & Gills, B, (Eds.). (1993). *The world system: Five hundred years or five thousand?* London: Routledge.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gall, J., Gall, M., & Borg, W. (1999). *Applying educational research: A practical guide.* Don Mills, ON: Addison Wesley Longman.

Ghosh, R. (1996). Economic liberalization and its impact on women and women's education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XLII* (2), 115-120.

Gilroy, P. (1987). *There ain't no black in the union jack.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. In F. Henry, C. Tator, W. Mattis, & T. Rees, *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society* (p. 23). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gramsci, A. (1971 [1927]). On Education. *Selections from the prison notebooks.* New York: International.

Greeley, A. (1998). The Second Vatican Council - occurrence or event? *Commonweal,* Sept 1998.

Hall, B. (2000). Global civil society: Theorizing a changing world. *Convergence, 33* (1/2), 10-32.

Harbeson, J., Rothchild, D. and Chazan, N. (Eds.). (1994). *Civil society and the state in Africa.* Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.

Henry, F., Tator, C., Mattis, W., & Rees, T. (2000). *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society.* Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Howlett, D. (1991). Social movement and development education. *Canadian and International Education, 20*(1), 125-130.

Ikeda, S. (2002, forthcoming). 20th century anti-systemic historical processes and US hegemony: Free trade imperialism, national economic development, and free enterprise imperialism. In Ramon Grosfoguel (Ed.), *The modern world system in the twentieth century*. Greenwood Press.

Isa. 29:10 (New Revised Standard Version).

Janesick, V. J. (1998). *"Stretching" exercises for qualitative researchers*. London, UK: Sage.

KAIROS. (2001). *Turning the tables: Education for action guide, 2001-2002*. Toronto: Author.

Kennan, G. (1948). U. S. State Department Policy Planning, Study #23. In J. Pilger, *Hidden agendas* (p. 59). New York: New Press.

Ksenych, E., & Liu, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Conflict, order & action: Readings in sociology*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lamy, S. L. (1989). The national interest or global interests? *ATA Magazine, 69*(4), 40-47.

Larson, R. S. V. (1988). *Ten Days for World Development: A case study in development education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Calgary.

Lev. 25:36 (New Revised Standard Version).

Linds, W. (1991). Walking together: Development education and Canada's social movements. *Canadian and International Education, 20*(1), 131-142.

Lk. 9:48 (New Revised Standard Version).

MacEoin, G. (1997). Papal doubts about unbridled capitalism: it is in the first centuries of Christianity that we must look for the true foundations of Catholic social teaching. *National Catholic Reporter, 33*(13), 12.

Maquila Solidarity Network. (May 2000). *Stop sweatshops: Educator's handbook*. Toronto.

Marchak, P. (1988). *Ideological perspectives on Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1995). Designing qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Dictionary of sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mt. 13:13,14 (New Revised Standard Version).

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayo, P. (1996). Transformative adult education in an age of globalization: A Gramscian-Freirean synthesis and beyond. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XLII* (2), 148-160.

Mayo, Peter (1999). *Gramsci, Freire and adult education: Possibilities for transformative action.* London, UK: Zed Books.

McMillan, J. H., & Wergin, J. F. (2002). *Understanding and evaluating educational research* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill / Prentice-Hall.

Micah 6:8 (New Revised Standard Version).

Mihevc, J. (2002). Africa takes centre stage at G8. *The Catalyst, 25*(3), 6-7.

Mills, C. W. (1959). The Promise. From *The Sociological Imagination.* Oxford University Press. In E. Ksenych & D. Liu (Eds.). (1996). *Conflict, order & action: Readings in sociology.* (pp. 11-12). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Moffat, J. (1991). Networks within Canada; partnerships abroad: The new challenge for development education. *Canadian and International Education, 20*(1), 13-20.

Neh. 5:10 (New Revised Standard Version).

OXFAM (2002). Rigged rules, double Standards: Trade, globalisation and the fight against poverty. Oxford, UK: Author.

Pannu, R. S. (1996). Neoliberal project of globalization: Prospects for democratization of education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research,* XLII (2), 87-101.

Parkland Institute. *The Globalism Project.* Retrieved April 15, 2002, from http://www.ualberta.ca/GLOBALISM/

Petras, J., & Veltmeyer, H. (2001). *Globalization unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st century.* London: Zed Books.

Philip, M. Nourbese. (n.d.). Frontiers: Essays and writings on racism and culture 1984-1992. In Edmonton Social Planning Council, 1994, *Alberta Facts,* No. 15.

Pike, G. (1997). Global education: Reflections from the field. *Green Teacher 54,* 6-10.

Pilger, J. (1998). *Hidden agendas.* New York: New Press.

Polanyi, K. (1944). *Origins of our time: The great transformation.* London, UK: Camelot Press.

Ps. 15:5 (New Revised Standard Version).

Quadragesimo Ano. (1931).

Reeve, T., & Allan, G. (2000). *Mandate for the new millennium: Ten Days for Global Justice, empowering Canadians for global change.* Toronto: The Centre for Research in Religion, Emmanuel College of Victoria University and the Toronto School of Theology in the University of Toronto.

Reiman, J. (2001). *The rich get richer and the poor get prison: Ideology, class and criminal justice.* Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Reimer, J. K., Shute, J. C. M., & McCreary, E. K. (1993). Canadian nonformal development education: A typology of educational strategies. *Canadian and International Education, 22*(2), 1-15.

Rerum Novarum. (1891).

Ritzer, George (1992). *Contemporary sociological theory* (3rd ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Roberts, P. (2000). *Education, literacy, and humanization: Exploring the work of Paulo Freire.* Westport, Connecticut • London: Bergin & Garvey.

Rom. 11:8 (New Revised Standard Version).

Samoff, J. (1996). African education and development: Crisis, triumphalism, research, loss of vision. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XLII* (2), 121-147.

Satzewich, V. (1989). Racism and Canadian immigration policy: The government's view of Caribbean migration, 1962-66. *Canadian Ethnic Studies.* In F. Henry, C. Tator, W. Mattis, & T. Rees, *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society* (p. 39). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Shadd, A. (1989). Institutionalized racism and Canadian history: Notes of a Black Canadian. Appendix in C. E. James (Ed.), *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring race, ethnicity and culture* (pp. 505-11). Toronto: Sheridan College. In F. Henry, C. Tator, W. Mattis, & T. Rees, *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society* (p. 69). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Shiva, V. Export at any cost: OXFAM's free trade recipe for the Third World. Retrieved May 14, 2002, from http://www.dev-zone.org/links/Docs/3120VandanOxfam. html).

Sklair, L. (1995). Social movements and global capitalism. *Sociology, 29* (3), 495-512. In P. Mayo (1996). Transformative adult education in an age of globalization: A Gramscian-Freirean synthesis and beyond. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XLII* (2), 148-160.

Special 25th Anniversary Issue of *Update, 3* (2). [December 1996]

Stone, D. (1985). *Evaluative report on Ten Days for World Development.* Mississauga: Church Search and Research.

Stuart, R. (1996). Understanding difference differently: A Canadian view. In

Walters and Manicom (Eds.), *Gender in popular education: Methods for empowerment* .(pp. 134-148). London & New Jersey: Zed.

Swift, J. (1999). *Civil society in question.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Ten Days for World Development. (1981). *Policy Statement.* Toronto: Author.

Ten Days for World Development. (1992). *Education-Action Guide.* Toronto: Author.

Ten Days for World Development. (1995). *Agreement to Re-Mandate.* Toronto: Author.

Thomas, R. M. (1998). *Conducting educational research: A comparative view.* Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.

Toh, S. H. (1993). Bringing the world into the classroom: Global literacy and a question of paradigms.*Global Education - Global Literacy, 1*(1), 9-17.

Toh, S. H. (1999). Building a culture of peace. *Speaking About Rights, 43*(3), 1-7. (Journal of the Canadian Human Rights Foundation).

Tye, B., & Tye, K. (1992). *Global education: A study of school change.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

UNESCO (1992). *Culture of Peace Programme.* Rome: Author.

Wallerstein, I. (1991). Culture as the ideological battleground of the modern world-system. In I. Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and geoculture* (pp. 158-183). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, I. (1992). The west, capitalism, and the modern world-system. In *Review, XV* (4), 561-619.

Waterman, P. (1993). Internationalism is dead! Long live global solidarity? In J. Brecher, J. Childs, & J. Cutler (Eds.), *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 257-261). Boston: South End.

Weber, M. (1904-1905/1958). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism.* New York: Scribner's.

Weber, Max. (1964 [1922]). *The sociology of religion.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Welton, M. (1998). Civil society as theory and project: Adult education and the renewal of global citizenship. In D. Wildemeersch, M. Finger, & T. Jansen, (Eds.), *Adult Education and social responsibility: Reconciling the irreconcilable?* (pp. 187-220). New York: Peter Lang.

Werner, W. (1990). *Explorations in Development/Global Education.* Vancouver: Research and Development in Global Studies, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia.

Wildemeersch, D., Finger, M., & Jansen, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Adult Education and social responsibility: Reconciling the irreconcilable?* New York: Peter Lang.

World Development Movement. Retrieved April 20, 2002, from http://www.wdm. org.uk/about/ index.htm

World Development Movement. States of unrest II: Anti-IMF protests sweep developing world. Retrieved April 20, 2002, from http://www.wdm.org. uk/presrel/current/Unrest12.htm

Young, C. (1994). In Search of Civil Society. In J. Harbeson, D. Rothchild, and N. Chazan (Eds.), *Civil society and the state in Africa* (pp. 33-50). Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner.

Appendix

Appendix A.   **Letter of Consent to Participate in the Study**

Please be advised that I, _____, agree to participate in the research project entitled: *Ten Days for Global Justice: A Study of a Non-formal Approach to Global Education in Alberta.* This agreement is made subject to the following conditions:

1. That I am aware that:

     i) the purpose of this study is to develop a critical understanding and analysis of the vision and mission of Ten Days for Global Justice.
     i) data will be collected through in-depth interviews with a number of key Alberta organizers and leaders of Ten Days. Tape-recorded interviews will last approximately one and one-half to two hours.
     iii) there will be no deception associated with the conduct of this study.

2. That the study is to be conducted according to the Ethics of Research as developed by the University of Alberta and the information provided by the the approved Research Ethics Review Application of the Department of Educational Policy Studies. Further,

     i) My participation in this this interview is entirely voluntary and, as a participant, I am guaranteed confidentiality. Neither my name nor any other information which could identify me will be included in the final report.
     ii) I will be free to withdraw from the study at any time and no information that I have provided will be included in the report or final thesis without my express consent.
     iii) All interviews will be tape-recorded and transcribed to assist in analysis of data.
     iv) Following each interview, a transcript of my interview will be provided to me as soon as possible.
     v) After being provided with a transcript of my comments, I will be able to make any revisions I feel necessary, even to the extent of striking certain information from the record.
     vi) I am aware of the name of the researcher (Lee Ellis) and the department/institution to which this study/thesis will be submitted (Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton).
     vii) An executive summary and/or report of the final thesis will be provided to me (upon request) in recognition of my assistance in this study.
     viii) My approval to participate in this study is given subject to the guarantee of confidentiality at the bottom of this form. My signature indicates that you have read this document to me and that I understand its contents.

Name of Participant:_____

Signature:_____ Date:_____

Researcher's Initials:_____

Appendix B. **Guarantee of Confidentiality**

I, Lee Ellis, undertake to provide you, _____, as
interview participant in the research project, *Ten Days for Global Justice: A Study of a*
Non-formal Approach to Global Education in Alberta, with the guarantee of complete
confidentiality.

At no time will your name, or other means of identification, be divulged. You will be
assigned a pseudonym at the outset and this pseudonym will be used in data reporting and
analysis.

Every effort will be made to avoid identification through description of particular incidents
or occurrences. If, after examining a transcript of your interview, you wish to make changes
or have certain material removed entirely from all areas of the study, you have the right to do
so.

Researcher's Signature:_____

Appendix C.   **Interview Schedule**

Preamble The intention is to conduct in-depth interviews with a sample of key Alberta organizers and leaders of Ten Days for Global Justice (TEN DAYS) to gain a better understanding of their perspectives and insights into the program.

Questions to be asked will include:

1. What, in your view, are the core goals of TEN DAYS with regard to the global education of Canadians in general, and Albertans in particular?

2. What, in your view, are the principal objectives of TEN DAYS with regard to the global education of Canadians in general, and Albertans in particular?

3. In the course of this interview, we will be talking a great deal about development and related issues. What does 'development' mean to you? What do you see as being some of the causes of lack of development? What might be some of the solutions to development problems?

4. Again, in your view, what are the key strategies of TEN DAYS with regard to the global education of Canadians in general, and Albertans in particular?

5. In your opinion, how effective have these strategies you mentioned been in achieving the goals and objectives of TEN DAYS?

6. TEN DAYS leaders and participants are responsible, in some sense, for guiding/facilitating a growing awareness of issues which come under the umbrella of global education and offering some direction for ways of thinking about ways of dealing with these issues. What sorts of processes are in place within the TDGJ program to enable TDGJ educators to gain competencies in global education?

7. What have been some of the important obstacles, from your point of view, that TEN DAYS has encountered in meeting its goals and objectives?

8. How has TEN DAYS gone about overcoming these obstacles?

9. What kinds of evaluation strategies have been used by TEN DAYS to measure progress toward goal attainment and achievement of program objectives? What are the indicators used?

10. With regard to the non-formal practice of global education in Canada and Alberta, what lessons can be drawn from the experience of TEN DAYS in promoting the understanding and solidarity of Canadians with the issues of international development, aid and similar issues?

11. Expanding a bit further on the previous question, what are the specific implications of these lessons, positive or negative, for the future work of TEN DAYS?

12. In 1988 Rebecca Larson did a detailed analysis of the predecessor organization to Ten Days for Global Justice, which was known as Ten Days for World

Development. In concluding her study, Larson identified a number of issues which she felt merited further research and attention. I will read you the questions she posed and ask you for your opinion as to whether these are still issues which need to be addressed in the context of TEN DAYS.

i) What are the limits of development education (global education) in relationship to significant societal institutions, particularly when the relationship is one of sponsorship and funding?

ii) What is the role of male and female decision-making models in relationship to development education (global education), and what are the implications for the involvement or lack of it by male and female sectors of the society?

iii) What importance do race, class and gender analyses of development issues have within a Canadian context, and what are the implications for the practice of development education (global education) within Canada?

iv) What are the implications of identifying particular constituencies within Canada for the effectiveness of development education (global education)?

v) Does action or education take priority in determining the direction and focus of development education (global education) programs? In other words, where does one most effectively enter the circle of praxis?

vi) What is the place of domestic development issues and response to those issues in development education (global education) which prioritizes an international focus?